Columbia University
in the City of New York

LIBRARY

tv Libr

THE MONKS OF THE WEST

VOLUME THE SIXTH

THE

MONKS OF THE WEST

FROM ST. BENEDICT TO ST. BERNARD

BY THE

COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT

MEMBER OF THE FRENCH ACADEMY

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE

REV. F. A. GASQUET, D.D., O.S.B.

AUTHOR OF

"HENRY VIII. AND THE ENGLISH MONASTERIES"

FIDE ET VERITATE

IN SIX VOLUMES

VOLUME THE SIXTH

NEW YORK

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND LONDON

MDCCCXCVI

932
M76

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
At the Ballantyne Press

CONTENTS

BOOK XIX—(*continued*)

ST. GREGORY, MONK AND POPE

CHAP. PAGE

VI. ST. GREGORY VII. IN HIS CORRESPONDENCE, HIS HOLINESS, AND HIS VICTORY 3

BOOK XX

THE PREDECESSORS OF CALIXTUS II.

I. VICTOR III., URBAN II., PASCAL II., AND GELASIUS II. . 41

II. YVES DE CHARTRES AND THE PURITY OF MARRIAGE . . 93

III. URBAN II., PETER THE HERMIT, AND THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE CRUSADE 104

IV. THE PAPACY AND THE FIRST CRUSADE 115

V. ROYALTY AND THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH . . 125

VI. DISTINCTION OF THE TWO POWERS 165

VII. THE CHURCH IN CONFLICT WITH THE EVIL PASSIONS OF KINGS 224

VIII. 245

IX. FRANCE ALWAYS ORTHODOX, AND CLUNY ALWAYS UNRIVALLED 273

X. THE POPE AND THE EMPEROR AT ROME 292

XI. VICTORY OF THE TEMPORAL POWER 319

XII. TRIALS OF THE PAPACY 360

XIII. TRIUMPH OF THE SPIRITUAL POWER 381

XIV. THE PAPACY RECONCILED TO THE EMPIRE 431

321832

BOOK XIX—(*continued*)

ST. GREGORY, MONK AND POPE

CHAPTER VI

ST. GREGORY VII. IN HIS CORRESPONDENCE, HIS HOLINESS, AND HIS VICTORY

Fine qualities allied to great vices in Henry IV.—Young, ardent, and passionate, he was never trustworthy.—Gregory VII. was not jealous of the power of bishops.—Grief of the Pope at witnessing the cowardice of the French bishops and the scandalous life of their king.—The paternal affection of St. Gregory extended over kingdoms, churches, and individuals.—Gregory the first to plan a crusade in the Holy Land.—Nature of the relations of Gregory VII. with princes and nations.—Gregory's letters to the King of Germany, to the Duke of Poland, to the Kings of Denmark, Hungary, and Norway.—What is particularly striking in Gregory's letters is his passion for justice and his fear of compromising the safety of his soul.—Gregory's tenderness of heart seen throughout his intimacy with the two countesses Beatrice and Matilda.—Confidences made by Gregory to Abbot Hugh of Cluny.—His tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin.—He restrains even his most innocent inclinations.—He left to his successors an authority against which no human power has been able to prevail.—The triumph of Gregory VII. was the triumph of humility over pride, of the soul in subjection to God over the flesh in revolt against Him.

If a conscientious study of facts could yet leave in our minds some doubts as to the respective merits of the two causes which were at war in the eleventh century, all that is needed to dissipate them is a comparison of the characters of the two individuals in whom were personified the Empire and the Church.

It would be unjust, however, to deny to Henry IV. many of those qualities which make a great king; he possessed together with extraordinary activity, perseverance, and intrepidity, worthy of the best of causes, a rare prudence and sagacity.[1] But these qualities were united in him to all the

[1] "Homo magni consilii et mirabiliter sagax."—Bonizo, p. 816.

vices and excesses of a tyrant. We have seen with what deeds of cruelty and of monstrous debauchery he was reproached by the German Catholics. The Saxons declared that they had taken up arms against him less to avenge serious injuries, and escape the yoke of an oppressive despotism, than to punish the incest and sacrilege of which the prince had been guilty,[1] and which entitled him to rank first among the most cruel tyrants. Christendom, indeed, saw with horror the revival, in the reign of a king professedly obedient to the Gospel, of such infamies as are attributed to the gods of mythology and the most barbarous persecutors of the Church.[2] Were the excesses imputed to Henry exaggerated? It is difficult to believe it; for they are affirmed by all orthodox writers, and contested by no one.[3] Nevertheless, several incidents of the monarch's life prove that evil passions had not extinguished in him that foundation of faith and attachment to religion which then formed, as it were, the moral basis of existence.[4] In this respect we must not confound Henry IV. with more modern persecutors, who were strangers, alike in faith and practice,

[1] "Hos . . . quorum terram, quod omnium quæ passi sumus gravissimum ducimus, inauditis adinventionibus nec Christiano ore nominandis incestaret."—LAMBERT, ann. 1073, ap. PERTZ, v. 198. Cf. eumdem, pp. 201–203.

[2] "Si mihi recolas Jovem adulterum, Neronem spurcum . . . Maximiminum, &c. . . . ego adhuc istis illi palmam dederim, qui aut æqualis eis aut etiam superior in flagitiis . . . in augmentum sceleris eamdem flagitia sub titulo christianitatis peregit."—GEROH. REICHESP., *De statu eccles.*, c. x.

[3] Stentzel affirms that Henry IV.'s excesses must be attributed to his bad education and the evil counsels of the favourites who surrounded him.

[4] For example, the profound indignation of the emperor on hearing of the destruction of the church of Harsbourg (*Lamb. Schafn.*, ad ann. 1074) —his grief at being deprived of the sacraments at Christmas while he was a prisoner (1105).—SIGEB. GEMBL., and UDALR., *Cod.*, p. 116. If we were to adopt the system of the Imperialist historians, we should attribute to skilful hypocrisy the expression of sentiments little in harmony with the actions of Henry IV.; but it is at once juster and more natural to allow that this prince may have had revulsions of feeling such as a thousand circumstances of his social life might bring about.

to the worship which, for the profit of selfish interests, they undertook to regulate. The emperor's refusal to accept, at Canossa, the communion which Gregory offered to him as a pledge of confidence in his repentance, attests at least the respect the prince felt for the august sacrament of the altar;[1] for such an action must have been considered as an avowal of the crimes imputed to him, and an acknowledgment that the sentence pronounced was just.[2] The perjured, in general, do not yield to such scruples at the moment of committing sacrilege. Unhappily, this was the only moment of the prince's life in which he gave real proof of conscientiousness; the ruling trait of his character was an absolute want of straightforwardness and sincerity. Contemporaries wondered to find in a man so young and so passionate, so great a perfection in cunning, dissimulation, and perfidy; they found it hard to explain how the extreme vivacity of such a character never tempted him to lose an opportunity of hypocrisy or deceit.

This inveterate duplicity was the great objection which other princes opposed to all projects of reconciliation with Henry.[3] In Gregory, on the contrary, they found nothing

[1] Cf. LAMBERT, ann. 1077; and BONIZO, *Liber ad amicum*, ap. ŒFELE, p. 816.

[2] The reflections of Stentzel on this point (vol. i. p. 410) must be read to form an idea of the blindness and bitterness to which Protestant fanaticism may lead. The only excuse for the author is, that he can neither know nor imagine what the Holy Eucharist is with regard to Catholic unity, both for him who consecrates and for him who communicates. It is Stentzel who, at p. 502, discovers Jesuits in the eleventh century, which, at all events, is a testimony to the invariable nature of the active forces in the Church.

[3] This is confessed almost on every page by Stentzel, his ardent apologist (vol. i. pp. 306–336, 341–414). At the same time, the author is far from considering it a crime in the emperor. "The eloquence of Archbishop Guibert of Ravenna," he says, "made the king repent of what he had done; but the cunning Henry resolved to get all possible profit from what had passed, and to trick the Pope before breaking with him. . . . The veil of former prejudices fell from his eyes; he saw clearly; his bonds were broken; free, without restraint, *fearing scarcely anything of all that his epoch considered holy*, THENCEFORWARD HE WALKED THROUGH LIFE

which could be supposed cunning—no trace of a complicated or tortuous policy: frankness, honesty, and an indomitable perseverance, were the Pontiff's only weapons.[1] From the first day of his reign to the last, no change is to be observed in his conduct or in his attitude—it is always the simplicity of faith victoriously combating all the enterprises of the world and all the artifices of error. Let us hear, on this subject, the unassailable testimony of one of the Pope's most openly-declared adversaries, a violent partisan of the schism, Thierry, Bishop of Verdun, who wrote to the Pope in these words: "This is what we know of you from yourself and from persons worthy of all confidence: Pointed out from infancy by certain presages of future glory—enrolled in youth among the Christian army, among the contemners of the world—laboriously devoted to the service of the Church,—as archdeacon you won the love of all, and reached the height of Christian renown. More than once, on the point of being elected Pope, you escaped by flight from the burden with which you were threatened: but at last you were obliged to submit to the yoke; and then, urged by the necessities of your pastoral charge, you were forced to labour with all your strength to bring back perverted hearts, to teach the truth without respect to persons; later still, having become the object of mortal execration to the reprobate, you have, without swerving, followed the royal path on which you had

AS A MAN. He began the struggle with courage and decision, with inexhaustible resources of wit and cunning" (vol. i. pp. 414-416, ed. of 1827). We see what becomes of historical morality in the hands of scientific rationalism. Stentzel no doubt counts among the devices of this *courageous* and *enlightened* prince the many demonstrations of submission and devotion which he made to the Pope from 1077 to 1080. The excuse given by the historian (pp. 446-452, &c.) is, that the emperor *was not yet ready.*

[1] Stentzel himself is obliged to acknowledge this (vol. i. p. 362), though later (vol. ii. pp. 148-153) he accuses Gregory of duplicity. We insist on this historian's contradictions, because we recognise in him one of the remarkable writers of modern Germany, although, unlike Voigt and Bowden, he has used great knowledge and an excellent method only to give way to the narrowest and most profane views.

entered, striking right and left with the weapons of justice and of prayer."[1]

However, in order to appreciate the character of Gregory VII., we are not reduced to the evidence, in some degree involuntary, of his adversaries, nor to conjectures and the laborious researches of erudition. The nine books preserved to us of the correspondence of the great Pope,[2] are an imperishable monument of that good faith, moderation, uprightness, tenderness of heart—in a word, of all the various forms of greatness—which filled the soul of the immortal champion of the Church.

Therefore certain Protestant critics, understanding all the

[1] "De vobis vel a fidelibus audita, vel a nobis ipsis comperta. . . Strenua et laudabili officii hujus administratione in totius orbis notitiam et dilectionem brevi pervenisse ad summum Christiani nominis. . . . Juxta quod boni et fide digni homines attestantur. . . . Culmen. . . . Urgenti pastoralis officii necessitate, distorta perversorum corda ad rectitudinis lineam summa vi corrigere nitentem, absque personæ acceptione veritatem omnibus palam facere . . . perditorum hominum odium et detractionem, immo execrationem acerrimam usque ad mortis damnationem incurrisse : tamen in omnibus inconcussum, immotum viam regiam quam semel intravit per arma justitiæ, a dextris et a sinistris arguendo, obsecrando, increpando, fortiter adhuc incedere. Hæc sunt quæ de vobis conperimus . . . hæc de vobis credimus."—*Thes. anecd.*, vol. i. p. 215. It is remarkable that these eulogies, heaped upon Gregory VII. by a violent adversary, agree identically with those given to him by one of his most enthusiastic partisans : "Nactus omnium bonorum dilectionem ob zeli Dei fervorem et justitiæ exequtionem. Sed quia nulla est societas luci ad tenebras, perditorum hominum odium et detractionem, immo persecutionem acerrimam incurrit ; regiam tamen viam quam semel intraverat, inconcussus, immotus, per arma justitiæ a dextris et sinistris fortiter incessit."—HUG. FLAVIN., p. 207, ap. LABBE.

[2] The tenth book of St. Gregory's correspondence has been lost, and there are only two letters of the eleventh and last. This collection, composed of 361 letters, is known by the name of *Regestum Gregorii VII.*, and is found in all the collections of councils. That of Labbe, which was published at Venice by Coletti in 1730, has two appendices containing seventeen more letters than the other collections (378 instead of 361). These seventeen letters are important ; but it is to be desired, in the interests of religious and historical truth, that there might be added to the letters already published those which are, as it were, lost in the works of Pau Bernried, Hugh de Flavigny, and, above all, of Bruno.

importance of such a document, have made incredible efforts to prove that it is not authentic.[1] This argument could not fail to be maintained, beyond the Rhine, by one of those sophists who exhaust themselves in trying to show that the Gospel itself is but an altered text, and who do not find it extraordinary that the unknown inventor of the correspondence of Pope Gregory VII. should have been able, like the writer of the Gospel, to exhibit a genius so lofty and so pure.

It is from the correspondence of Pope Gregory that we learn really to know and to love the Pontiff. A man cannot write nearly 400 letters, many of them with his own hand, in haste, in the most various circumstances, without betraying, here and there, the depths of his soul.[2] But we defy the most minute criticism to point out, in the correspondence of the illustrious Pope, a single passage, a single line, where there appears the smallest trace of egotism, of worldly ambition, of anger—of any one, indeed, of the lower passions of humanity.[3]

[1] It is M. Cassander of Hesse Darmstadt who may claim the honour of having made this fine discovery in 1842. The author, in his clumsy German libel, depends chiefly on a passage of letter 5, book viii., in which Gregory reproaches Henry IV. for having taken part in the election of the anti-Pope Cadalaus in 1063, at which date Henry was only thirteen, and consequently could not be responsible for the actions of his Council. It is not impossible that a wrong date may have found its way into the letter in question; but to conclude thence that all the other letters are apocryphal is an enormity. We may remark, also, that the accusation brought by the Pope against Henry is not to be found in either of the two sentences fulminated against him.

Since the death of M. de Montalembert there has been published a new and very good edition of the *Letters of St. Gregory*, by M. Jaffé, the collaborator of M. Pertz, whose premature loss has been regretted by the learned.—*Note by the Editor.*

[2] "Vobis enim non aliquem vicarium in dictando acquiro, sed me ipsum labori, licet rusticano stylo, supponi."—Ep. i. 50, addressed to the two countesses Beatrice and Matilda.

[3] Of all the historians who have hitherto treated of the pontificate of Gregory VII., M. l'Abbé Rohrbacher is the one who has most profited by St. Gregory's correspondence. With the authentic text of these letters mutilated and falsified by the adversaries of the papacy, ignored or neglected by its defenders, the Catholic historian has been able to refute

It is then to this source, beyond suspicion, that the friends of Catholic truth must apply in order to complete the proofs of all that has been said of the greatness and holiness of Gregory. There they will see how the Pontiff regarded that awful ministry which bound him to truth and justice towards all men; which demanded of him to compromise no man's salvation by his silence;[1] which, every day, loaded him with the anguish of an immense responsibility;[2] which, in short, invested him with an authority so great that all the efforts of kings and emperors, all human forces whatever, seemed to have no more weight against it than the dust or the straw that the wind carries away.[3] In this authority the episcopate, whose power and dignity seemed to him superior to royal majesty,[4] ought to have largely shared; for Gregory, we repeat, was no jealous adversary of episcopal influence. He indeed complained bitterly of the crimes of many of the bishops of his time; he perceived that all the ills of Christendom arose from the prevarication of those among whom

victoriously both the calumnies of Protestants, and certain assertions, at least careless, of Fleury and Bossuet, in the *Défense des quatre articles*, attributed, it is to be hoped wrongly, to the great bishop. The sixty-fifth book of the *Hist. univ. de l'Eglise*, by Rohrbacher, is, with the work of the Anglican Bowden, the best account we know of the pontificate of Gregory VII.

[1] "Non ignorare credimus prudentiam vestram, quin sancta et apostolica sedes princeps et universalis mater sit omnium ecclesiarum et gentium quas divina clementia ad agnitionem sui nominis in fide Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi per evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam venire præordinavit: quibus hanc curam et perpetuam debet sollicitudinem, ut sicut ad conservandam catholicæ fidei veritatem, ita quoque ad cognoscendam et tenendam justitiam documenta et salutifera administret monita. Ad cujus dispensationis officium . . . creditum nobis ministerium valde pertimescimus, scientes quoniam et his qui prope et his qui longe sunt debitores sumus, nec apud supernum Judicem excusationis locum habere poterimus, si nostra taciturnitate eorum aut salus negligitur aut culpa fovetur."—Ep. iv. 28, ad Hispanos.

[2] "Potestas, qua quotidie angustamur apostolicæ sedis."—Ep. iv. 1.

[3] "Hoc in animo gerens, quod regum et imperatorum virtus, et universa mortalium conamina, contra apostolica jura et omnipotentiam summi Dei quasi favilla computentur et palea."—Ep. iii. 8, ad Thedald. cleric. Mediol.

[4] Ep. ii. 5, and iv. 2.

he ranged himself;[1] and he congratulated himself that the laity, not excepting women, should devote themselves to the liberty of the Church when so many prelates deserted the cause.[2] But the Pontiff's correspondence gives, on almost every page, proof that episcopal authority had no firmer defender than he. He wished that even when episcopal decisions were unjust they should be obeyed, provided they did not compromise the general safety of the Church.[3] We see him refusing presents from the Count of Anjou, because he was excommunicated by his bishop. The jurisdiction of bishops as to consecration was, with him, the object of most scrupulous respect.[4] He never failed to enforce in their favour the decretals of the martyr popes against unworthy clerks;[5] finally, as a crowd of examples shows, he never hesitated, in disputes between bishops and monks, to decide against the latter, even his fellow-Clunists, if equity required it.[6] For him, the princes of the Church were truly the leaders of the Lord's army; and he urged them incessantly, by the example of secular chivalry, to self-sacrifice, devotion, and perseverance in the battles of their Master.[7] "They will tell you," he wrote to the Archbishop of Mayence, in 1075, "that you have a right to put off till another time the strict execution of our decrees; but boldly answer thus: 'When knights have been warned to hold themselves in readiness for war, what should they do if they hear that enemies are carrying sword and fire into their king's palace? Should they instantly seize their weapons to chase and overwhelm the assailant, or should they stay quietly watching

[1] "Nos . . . prælati . . ."—Ep. ii. 45.

[2] Ep. ii. 11.

[3] Ep. ii. 45, and ix. 22.

[4] Ep. ix. 29.

[5] Ep. vii. 2.

[6] Ep. vi. 33.

[7] ". . . Et quid regios milites, sanctos videlicet sacerdotes oportet facere, nisi . . . clypeo caritatis munitos gladio divini verbi accinctos auctoritatis vigore consurgere; multum namque debet nobis videre pudendum quod quilibet sæculi milites. . . . Et nos qui sacerdotes Domini dicimur, non pro illo nostro rege pugnemus qui omnia fecit ex nihilo!"—Ep. iii. 4. See also, Append., No. 15, the fine letter mentioned by Hugh de Flavigny, p. 230.

what the enemy will do? And what is the spirit of evil doing but devastating incessantly the Church of God? and what is the duty of the knights of the great King of Heaven —that is, His consecrated priests—but to throw themselves into the combat armed with the shield of charity and the sword of the divine word? . . . Ah, how should we blush! Secular knights every day combat for their temporal prince, every day they brave danger for his sake; and we, who are called the priests of the Lord, we do not fight for our King —for that King who has made all things out of nothing, who has not feared to suffer death for us, and who promises us an eternal reward!'"[1]

When Gregory saw the soldiers of God unfaithful to their mission, he could not restrain the holy fire of his reproaches. With what indignation did he raise his voice against the weakness of the French bishops in presence of the scandals and crimes of their king, Philip I.!

"It is you, my brothers," wrote the Pontiff, "who are guilty; you who, by failing to resist with sacerdotal vigour the wickedness of the prince, have become the open accomplices of his iniquities. We say it with regret and with lamentation, but it must be said: We fear lest you should receive the wages, not of shepherds, but of hirelings, since, seeing the wolf tear the Lord's flock under your very eyes, you have taken flight, and hidden yourselves in silence, like dogs who have forgotten how to bark! . . . If you fancy that to repress your sovereign's faults is unlawful, and incompatible with your oath of fidelity to him, know that you are in great error; for he who has saved a man from shipwreck even in spite of himself, is really more faithful to him than one who would have let him perish. As for the fear with which your king inspires you, it is useless to speak of it; for if you unite in defence of justice, you will acquire such strength that you will be able, without danger, to turn your prince from his bad habits, and at the same time to free your souls

[1] Ep. iii. 4.

from responsibility. But allowing that you have all things to fear, even death, nevertheless you ought not to abandon the liberty of fulfilling your priestly obligations. We implore you, therefore, and enjoin you, in virtue of our apostolic authority, to think of your country, your fame, and your salvation, and to go in one united body to the king. Let him be warned of the peril and shame which menace his realm and his soul! Denounce to his face the crimes of which he is guilty; seek to soften him; persuade him to make reparation for his rapine, to amend his depraved life, and, by the practice of justice, to restore the degraded glory and majesty of his kingdom!"[1]

In the case of Philip remaining obstinate in ill-doing, the Pope ordered an interdict on all the kingdom, announcing plainly that he would spare no effort to dethrone the king, and that, if the bishops showed themselves lukewarm in the execution of their duty, they also should be deposed. "Remember," he added in conclusion, "this divine word: 'The fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall be safe.'[2] So act, then, as to show that your souls are as free as your words; shun that destruction which will be drawn upon you by your fear of *a man weak as yourselves;* and, strong in the Lord and in the power of His might, go up, like brave knights of Christ, to the assault of glory in this world and in the next."[3]

[1] "Vos etenim in culpa estis qui dum perditissimis factis ejus non resistitis. . . . Proinde, quod inviti ac gementes dicimus, fugitis, dum quasi canes non valentes latrare, sub silentio vos absconditis. . . . De timore vero vanum est dicere. . . . Quoniam vobis ad defendendam justitiam conjunctis et constanter accinctis tanta virtus foret. . . . Etsi timor ac periculum mortis immineret, vos tamen a libertate vestri sacerdotalis officii desistere non oporteret. . . . Rogamus vos ut . . . patriæ, famæ vestræ ac saluti consulatis . . ."—Ep. ii. 5. Notice here the use of the word *patria*, the idea of which has been said to have been unknown in the middle ages.

[2] "Qui timet hominem, cito corruet, et qui sperat in Domino sublevabitur."—Prov. xxix. 25.

[3] "Ita agite, ita vos habetote, ut quam sit vobis libera mens et lingua ostendatis, nec timentes hominem infirmitatis vestræ ruinam patiamini,

Now let us listen while he rehearses, in the last letter he wrote, and from which we have already quoted some passages, the duties and trials imposed upon him by his mission, as head of the Church. "The only reason," he says, "which could have assembled and armed against us the princes of the nations and the princes of the priests is this—that we have not chosen to keep silence as to the danger which threatened the holy Church, or to become the accomplice of those who did not blush to reduce the bride of Christ to slavery. In every country of the world the poorest woman is allowed to choose a legitimate husband according to her will and to the law of the land; but at the desire of the wicked, and under the empire of detestable customs, the holy Church, the spouse of God, and our mother, is forbidden to remain lawfully faithful to her Husband, in obedience to her own will and to the Divine commandment. Can we suffer that the sons of this holy Church should be condemned, as if they were sprung from an infamous adultery, to have for fathers only heretics and usurpers? This is the source of all the evils, all the perils, and all the crimes which you have witnessed, and over which you groan. . . . There are in the world thousands of men who daily risk death to obey their lords; but for the great God of Heaven, for Him who has ransomed us, how many shrink, not from death only, but even from the hatred of certain other men! And if there are, as thank God we do find, though but in small numbers, men who resist the wicked openly, and even to death, for love of the Christian law, not only are they unsupported by their brethren, but they are held imprudent, indiscreet, foolish! . . . We conjure you, therefore, by the Lord Jesus, force yourselves to understand what are the tribulations and anguish which we endure at the hands of enemies of the Christian religion, and to

sed confortati in Domino, et in potentia virtutis ejus, sicut strenui milites Christi, ad celsitudinem præsentis ac futuræ gloriæ sublevamini."—Ep. ii. 5.

learn how and why we suffer them. Since the Church placed me, against my will, on the Apostolic throne, I have used all my efforts that the holy Church, the spouse of God, our mother and our lady, should regain her ancient glory, and become once more free, chaste, and catholic. But because nothing is more hateful than this to our old enemy, he has taken up arms. And since it is to me, though a sinner and unworthy, that the words of the prophet, 'Cry aloud and spare not,' have been spoken, therefore, willing or unwilling, without shame and without fear, without any earthly consideration, I cry, I cry, perpetually I cry aloud, to announce that the Christian religion, the true faith which the Son of God, come down from heaven, has taught us by our fathers, is degenerating into mere secular customs, is being lost, falling to nothing, and becoming an object of derision not only to the demon, but also to Jews, Saracens, and Pagans. For they at least obey those laws in which they believe; while we, intoxicated by love of the world and a miserable ambition, and sacrificing religion and honour to pride and cupidity, live without law, without reason, without faith, without hope. The small number of those who still fear God fight chiefly for themselves, and not for the common salvation of their brethren. How many are there who spend their sweat or their blood for God, as secular knights spend theirs for their lords, or even for their friends and vassals? If then, like all Christians, you believe St. Peter to be the prince and father of all the faithful, the chief shepherd after Christ, and that the holy Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Churches, I implore and command you,—I, your brother and your unworthy master,—to come to the help of that father and that mother, and thus to merit the absolution of your sins, the divine benediction and grace in this world and in the next."

Side by side with these majestic utterances of a zeal equally pure and intrepid, the correspondence of St. Gregory

shows us also the intense solicitude which filled his soul. This solicitude, the precious dower of the most lofty genius, embraced all the interests, great and small, of a world much vaster, as Gregory himself said, than the wide empire founded by the Romans, in which the rule of Christ had succeeded the rule of Augustus.[1] Glancing with paternal and attentive care from Norway[2] to Mauritania,[3] from Armenia[4] to Galicia,[5] turning away from the most critical events and the most imminent dangers to uphold in some distant country the despised rights of some obscure victim, Gregory everywhere interfered for the protection of weakness and of justice—sometimes for the shipwrecked, who were subject to the barbarous wreckers[6]—sometimes for poor women cruelly treated as witches by the Danes;[7] here to obtain the restitution of an unjustly detained succession,[8] there to hasten the return of an exile;[9] everywhere, and always, to enforce respect for the liberties of all, and for the possessions of religious houses.[10] On the other hand, as he always kept in view the general interests of nations and Churches, Gregory energetically maintained liturgical unity against all the too exclusively national and local pretensions of the Slavonic nations[11] and the people of the Iberian peninsula;[12] he protected Russia[13] and Denmark

[1] "Plus enim terrarum lex Romanorum pontificum quam imperatorum obtinuit: in omnem terram exivit sonus eorum et quibus imperavit Augustus, imperavit Christus."—Ep. ii. 75, addressed to Sweyn, King of Denmark.

[2] Ep. vi. 13. In this letter Gregory invites King Olave to send him the sons of the Norwegian nobles: "De junioribus et nobilibus terræ, quatenus sub alis Apostolorum Petri et Pauli sacris et divinis legibus diligenter edocti . . . lingua et scientia moribusque prudentes digne Deo prædicare et efficaciter excolere valeant."

[3] Ep. i. 22, 23; iii. 19, 20, 21.

[4] Ep. vii. 28; viii. 1.

[5] Ep. iv. 28; vi. 16.

[6] At the council of 1078.—LABBE, vol. x. p. 370, ed. Paris.

[7] Ep. vii. 221.

[8] Ep. vi. 32.

[9] Ep. vi. 29.

[10] Ep. i. 13, 31, 37, 81; ii. 15, 33, 69; ix. 6.

[11] Ep. vii. 11.

[12] "Romana te cupit scire Ecclesia, quod filios, quos Christo nutrit, non diversis uberibus, nec diverso cupit alere lacte."—Ep. iii. 18.

[13] Ep. ii. 73, 74.

against their enemies within and without,[1] Dalmatia[2] against foes and dangers of various kinds; public peace in Brittany,[3] Arragon,[4] and Bohemia,[5] against the intestine quarrels of princes and bishops; the liberty of merchants and pilgrims on their travels, from the extortions of the King of France;[6] the sacredness of marriage, and the helplessness of women against the barbarity of the Scotch:[7] finally, after having everywhere exercised his authority so as to re-establish discipline, to calm dissension, and to repair injustice in the heart of Christendom, he extended his solicitude beyond it; with noble confidence he recommended the Churches of Carthage and Hippo, purified by his cares,[8] to the Mussulman princes, who were their neighbours;[9] and forestalling the future by an inspiration worthy at once of his genius and of his great heart, he preached a crusade to the whole Christian world,[10] offering himself as leader in an enterprise which included not only

[1] Ep. vi. 13. [2] Ep. vii. 4. [3] Ep. vii. 15; iv. 5.
[4] Ep. vi. 16. [5] Ep. ii. 6, 7, 8, 71, 72.

[6] Ep. i. 35; ii. 5. From Ep. vii. 20, it appears that the young king atoned for his crimes, for the Pope speaks of them as things *olim*, and congratulates him on the good dispositions several times expressed by his ambassadors.

[7] "Nefas quod de Scotis audivimus, quod plerique uxores non solum deserunt, sed etiam vendunt, modis omnibus prohibere."—App. ad. Epist. ii. ad. Lanfrancum. [8] Ep. i. 21, 22; iii. 19, 20.

[9] It must be remarked that Anzir, King of Mauritania, sent to Gregory an embassy with presents and released prisoners, the very same year that the natural head of the Christians, King Henry, had issued a sentence of deposition against him (1076). The Pope replied to him in terms of indulgent charity: "Omnipotens Deus qui omnes homines vult salvos facere, et neminem perire, nihil est quod in nobis magis approbet, quam ut homo post dilectionem suam hominem diligat, et quod sibi non vult fieri, alii non faciat. Hanc itaque caritatem nos et vos specialius nobis quam ceteris gentibus debemus, qui unum Deum, licet diverso modo, credimus et confitemur. . . . Et quotidie laudamus et veneramur. . . . Ut ipse Deus in sinum beatitudinis sanctissimi patriarchæ Abrahæ post longa hujus vitæ spatia te perducet corde et ore rogamus."—Ep. iii. 21.

[10] The first mention of this project is found in his letter, written in 1074, to Count William of Burgundy.—Ep. i. 46. Some days later (March 1, 1074), he addressed himself to all Christians "(*omnibus Chris-*

the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre, but also the defence of the Church of Constantinople, schismatic as it was! "The Christians of the East," wrote the pontiff in 1074 to King Henry, on whom he thought he could count—"those Christians whom the pagans daily kill like sheep—have called upon me to come to their help. Filled with grief, and with a desire to do good, I would choose rather to give my life for them than to command the whole universe, and neglect them. I have therefore exhorted and implored all Christians to give their life for their brethren, to defend the law of Christ, and thus to display the true nobility of the sons of God. On both sides of the Alps my voice has been listened to, and more than fifty thousand men are preparing, if they can have me for leader and chief of the expedition, to march armed against the enemy, and to force their way, under the Lord's guidance, to His Holy Sepulchre. What chiefly urges me to this enterprise is, that the Church of Constantinople, though dissenting from us as to the Holy Spirit, looks to the Holy See for the restoration of harmony. Our fathers and predecessors, whose steps, though unworthy, we wish to follow, have often gone into those countries to consolidate the Catholic faith there; and we also, aided by the prayers of the faithful, if Christ deigns to open us a way, will go thither in our turn to defend the faith and those who profess it." [1]

tianis) fidem defendere volentibus," to tell them of the disasters of the Greeks, and exhort them to succour the Byzantine empire.—Ep. ii. 49. The first mention of the Holy Sepulchre is found in the letter to King Henry, a passage from which is quoted in the text. At the end of December of the same year he exhorts all those faithful to St. Peter beyond the Alps to send commissaries to him to prepare the means of going beyond sea.—Ep. ii. 37.

[1] "Magis enim vellem pro his animam meam ponere, quam eos negligens, universo orbi ad libitum carnis imperare. . . . Jam ultra quinquaginta millia ad hoc se preparant. . . . Armata manu contra inimicos Dei insurgere, et usque ad sepulcrum Domini, ipso ducente, pervenire. Illud etiam me ad hoc opus permaxime instigat, quod Constantinopolitana Ecclesia de Sancto Spiritu a nobis dissidens, concordiam apostolicæ sedis exspectat."—Ep. ii. 31.

The excesses and perfidy of the German sovereign put an obstacle in the way of the realisation of this great idea. But the germ, sown in the mind of Christian nations, was not to perish: twenty years later, the project conceived by Gregory was accomplished by the unanimous impulse of Europe; and the war-cry, *God wills it!* served for two centuries to draw to the banner of the Cross all the flower of Christian knighthood.

It is, above all, in the letters of St. Gregory that we must study the true nature of his relationships either with princes or with nations, and the kind of authority which he claimed over them. We see there that his sole object, in striving to maintain his supremacy, was the moral weight of a friend—the beneficent and profitable influence of a father. The instructions which he gave to the different Powers of this world were proclaimed without disguise, and with perfect frankness. He showed a great affection for the people,[1] rejoicing to see them retain their ancient liberties,[2] and promising them the cordial support of their

[1] We do not mean that Gregory addressed himself to the people in the modern sense—that is, to the lower classes exclusively, or to the whole mass of men—but it is certain that he wished to influence all classes, and all the free and active individuals of a nation possessing certain social functions, according to the place they occupied in the social hierarchy, as is shown by the heading of several of his letters. For example: "Omnibus episcopis, et viris nobilibus, cunctisque tam majoribus quam minoribus in insula Corsica consistentibus."—Ep. v. 4. "Archiepiscopis, ducibus, comitibus et universis Christifidelibus clericis et laicis, tam majoribus quam minoribus, in Teutonico regno constitutis."—Ep. iv. 28. "Clero et populo in Turonensi provincia constitutis."—Ep. vii. 15. "Duci et genti Venetorum."—Ep. ix. 8. "Duci et populo Venetiæ."—Ep. iv. 27, and ix. 8. And, as we have already said, it is evident that Gregory had succeeded in gaining the hearts of most of the lower classes in Germany by the reproach which Henry addressed to him in the letter announcing his deposition: "Rectores S. Ecclesiæ . . . sub pedibus tuis calcasti, in quorum conculcatione tibi favorem ab ore vulgi comparasti."—Cod. UDAL. BAB. ap. ECCARD., No. 163.

[2] "Multum gavisi pro dilectione . . . et libertate quam ab antiqua stirpe Romanæ nobilitatis acceptam conservastis."—Ep. iv. 27, *ad Venetos.* "Notum esse credimus . . . quod jam ab ineunte ætate terram vestram

mother, the Roman Church.[1] He reminded the nobles, then all-powerful, that they ought to preserve the inheritance of virtue, together with that of an illustrious descent.[2] "Friend," he wrote to a certain count, "thou who, by God's permission, hast command over many men, is it not just that, in return, thou shouldst consecrate to the service of the Lord at least one man—that is to say, thyself—by endeavouring to preserve all the purity of thy heart and soul? Those very duties which thou wouldst not have thy vassals neglect to perform towards thee, art thou not bound thyself to pay them to Him who has created thee in His image and ransomed thee with His blood?"[3]

To kings and sovereigns, whether inhabiting the neighbourhood of Rome—and always ready, as in the case of the Italian princes, to make him suffer for his generous frankness[4]—or whether dwelling at the ends of the earth, like the Scandinavian kings,[5] he constantly took care to give those lessons of humility which he judged necessary to subdue the working of pride in their hearts.[6]

Let us hear him speaking to the King of Germany himself: "You will never be truly king," he says, "until

et libertatem hujus gentis valde dileximus."—Ep. ii. 39, *Duci et populo Venetiæ;* see also Ep. ix. 8.

[1] "Romana Ecclesia mater sit omnium Christianorum; quæ licet ex consideratione officii sui omnium gentium saluti debeat invigilare, specialem tamen et quodammodo privatam vobis sollicitudinem oportet eam impendere."—Ep. i. 29, *ad Judices Sardiniæ.*

[2] Ep. viii. 16.—R. and N., *Nobilibus comitibus.*

[3] "Dignum est ut cui tuo metui tantam hominum multitudinem supposuit, hanc ei vicissitudinem recompenses, ut unum hominem, videlicet teipsum, pura semper mente sibi et corde conserves . . . ut quod a subjectis tibi vis fieri non negligas pro illius amore agere qui te ad suam imaginem creavit, et suo precioso sanguine redemit."—Ep. ix., *T. nobilissimo comiti.* Probably Thibault, Count of Champagne.

[4] Ep. vi. 37, to the Prince of Capua.

[5] Ep. vi. 13, to the King of Norway.

[6] "Imperatoribus et regibus, ceterisque principibus, ut elationes maris et superbiæ fluctus comprimere valeant arma humilitatis, Deo auctore, providere curamus."

you make your pride of domination bow before Christ, the King of kings, and assist Him to restore and to defend His Church;[1] . . . for otherwise how shall we succeed, being such as we are, in giving to our Creator and Redeemer that honour we demand from those who are but our brothers and companions in our state of servitude on earth?"[2]

To the Duke of Poland he said: "Keep ever before your eyes that last day of your life, which will come you know not when; and be always in fear of the last judgment, so as to use, with scrupulous care, the authority committed to you by God; for know that there is nothing, in all that has been confided to you, of which the Supreme Judge will not demand an account, and that you will have to undergo a judgment all the more severe as the right and the authority with which you are invested are the more extensive."[3]

To the King of Denmark he wrote: "With sincere affection we implore you to endeavour to exercise the royalty confided to you according to the will of God, to make your virtues match with the great name of king which you bear, and to enthrone in your own heart that justice which gives you the right to command your subjects. . . . You know that kings and beggars alike must end in dust and ashes; that we must every one appear at that last judgment, all the more terrible for us, priests and kings, as we must give account not only for ourselves, but for all those who shall have obeyed us. Live, then, my dearest brother, and reign, so that you may be able to stand without fear before the face of the eternal King, and receive from His divine hands a crown everlasting and beyond

[1] "Tunc demum regiam potestatem recte obtinere cognoscas, si regi regum, Christo, ad restaurationem defensionemque Ecclesiarum suarum faciendam, dominationis tuæ altitudinem inclinas."—Ep. ii. 30.

[2] "Honorem quem conservis et fratribus nostris exigimus."—Ep. iii. 7.

[3] "Scire enim debetis quoniam supernus arbiter quæ vobis commisit irrequisita non relinquet: cui tanto distinctius responsuri estis, quanto ampliora sunt jura et judiciorum moderamina quæ tenetis.

compare, in recompense for having worthily borne your earthly dignities."[1]

To the Spanish princes he spoke as follows: "You know, and you see evidence of it daily, how ephemeral life is, and how deceitful are our human hopes. Willing or unwilling, we must always hasten towards our end, and be always exposed to a certain fate, without knowing when death will strike us. . . . Think, then, of this end—think of the bitterness of the moment when you must leave this world, to rot under ground; think of the terrible judgment which will follow your actions, and arm yourselves beforehand against these dangers. Consecrate your arms, your wealth, your power, not only to secular pomp, but chiefly to the honour and service of the eternal King: govern, administer, in such a manner as to make of your well-doing an offering of righteousness pleasing to the Almighty; so that you may be able to depend on Him who alone gives safety to kings—who alone can snatch you from death, and transform the decaying grandeur which surrounds you here below into that sovereign beatitude and that divine glory which have neither rival, nor admixture, nor end."[2]

And to the King of Hungary this was his language: "We recommend to your prudence that you should walk, without delay or turning, in the way of justice—that you should defend, with paternal tenderness, widows, orphans,

[1] "Rogamus te et sincera et caritate monemus . . . quatenus eam, per cujus principatum subjectis imperas, in corde tuo semper regnare justitiam ostendas. . . . Nosci quod reges æqua conditione ut pauperes futuri sunt pulvis et cinis. . . . Age ergo, dilectissime, ut ita vives, ita regnes ut tunc æterni regis et judicis faciem securus aspicias," &c.—Ep. ii. 51, *ad Suenum regem Danorum.* See also Ep. v. 10, and vii. 21, to Haco, son and successor of Sweyn.

[2] "Quotidie videtis quam fluxa et fragilis est vita. . . . Arma vestra, opes, potentiam, non ad secularem pompam tantum, sed ad honorem et servitium æterni regis vertite . . . ut superindicat vos eminentiori claritate . . . et de caducis honoribus quos nunc habetis transferat vos in regnum gloriæ æternæ suæ, ubi nec beatitudine finem, nec gloria corruptionem, nec dignitas habet comparationem."—Ep. iv. 28, "regibus, comitibus, ceterisque principibus Hispaniæ."

and strangers, and not only do no wrong to churches, but preserve them from the violence and pride of invaders."[1]

He said to the King of Castile: "Your humility and obedience have earned for you the possession of divine truth and justice. . . . But as pious hearts love to be encouraged, and virtue needs always to be exercised, we exhort your highness to raise your soul from the perishable rank of this world towards that which is eternal—to use the one as a thing which will soon vanish, and to seek eagerly for the other, which gives at once the fulness and perpetuity of glory. . . . That our words may be better graven on your heart, we send you a little key, which contains a relic of the chains of the Blessed Peter, in hope that God, who by a miracle of His omnipotence broke the iron fetters of His apostle, may set you free by his merits and his intercession from the chain of your sins."[2] Elsewhere he says: "Do not hesitate to call to the highest offices of your Church foreigners or men of low birth, when they are suitable; for the Roman Republic has owed its growth, great in the time of the pagans, and yet greater under the dominion of Christ, to the fact that she has always thought less of noble race or origin than of the powers of the soul and body."[3]

To William the Conqueror, King of England, Gregory spoke thus: "Dearest son, whom I always embrace with tenderness in Christ, thou art already the pearl of the princes of our day, and I desire that, by thy justice and obedience to the Church, thou shouldst always serve as rule and model to all the princes of the future. If, when en-

[1] Ep. vi. 29.

[2] "Divina dignatio . . . usque ad vestra reservavit tempora ut veritatem Dei et justitiam . . . vestra mereretur suscipere sublimis humilitas et fidelis obedientia . . . vobis claviculam auream in qua de catenis Beati Petri benedictio continetur."—Ep. vii. 6.

[3] "Cum Romana respublica, ut paganorum tempore, sic et sub Christianitatis titulis inde maxime, Deo favente, excreverit, quod non tam generis aut patriæ nobilitatem, quam animi et corporis virtutes perpendendas adjudicavit."—Ep. ix. 2.

lightened by thy example, they will not follow thee, still thy glory and recompense shall not be lessened, and even in this world Heaven will grant to thee and to thy lineage victory, honour, and power. If thou hadst raised some wretched serf to royal estate, wouldst thou not expect that he should honour thee? Now God has taken thee, like a wretched serf of sin (for so are we all born), to make of thee, freely, a most powerful king: think and strive always, therefore, to glorify the almighty Jesus, to whom thou owest all that thou art, and do not let thyself be hindered by the crowd of evil rulers. Evil has always the multitude on her side; good has but the chosen few. In battle, the more cowards there are, the greater is the glory of the brave knight who stands firm. Yes, the more the great ones of this world, blinded by pride, rush to plunge into the abyss, the more fitting is it for thee, whom God has cherished more than them, to increase thy greatness by humility and obedience. May this God and Father deign so to imprint these virtues in thy soul, that after the triumphs and conquests of thy mortal reign, thou mayst sit down for ever in the heavenly kingdom among its kings and saints."[1]

To the Queen of England, who offered him beforehand whatever presents he might choose to ask of her, he answered: "Instead of gold, of jewels, or of all the precious things of this world, these are the presents which you may give me, O queen, and which I ask of you,—lead a pure life; share your wealth with the poor; love God

[1] "Nunc igitur, carissime et in Christo semper amplectende fili . . . talem te volo . . . ut, sicut cooperante Deo, gemma principum esse meruisti, ita regula justitiæ et obedientiæ forma cunctis terræ principibus esse merearis. . . . Sicut eum velles . . . sic et tu, quem ex servo peccati ut misero et pauperculo (ita quippe omnes nascimur) potentissimum regem Deus gratis fecit. . . . Nec ab hoc impediat te pessimorum principum turba. Nequitia enim multorum est, virtus autem paucorum. Gloriosius est probato militi, multis fugientibus, in prælio stare. Pretiosior illa est gemma quæ rarius invenitur. . . . Et in futuro cum sanctis regibus ad regna super cœlestia inexcogitabiliter meliora feliciter introducat."—Ep. vii. 33, written the year after he refused the homage of William.

and your neighbour;[1] esteem and cherish all that is honest and true."

To another queen he said: "Write in your heart that the sovereign of heaven, the queen exalted above all the choirs of angels, the honour and glory of all women, the source of salvation and of dignity to the elect, did not disdain, on earth, to live in poverty and in holy humility. God will only acknowledge as queen the woman who shall have ruled her life by the fear and love of Jesus: thus it is that so many holy women who have been of the poor of this world are glorified in heaven and earth; while so many queens, and even empresses, are dishonoured before God and before man. We implore and enjoin you, therefore, to labour to draw towards God the soul of our dear son, your lord and king, that he may serve the Church with all his power, and defend the poor, and all victims of oppression and injustice."[2]

Finally, to the King of Norway he wrote: "It is you of whom the Gospel speaks, 'They shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God.'[3] Hasten thither, then. You are at the end of the world; but if you quicken your steps you shall be associated in the royalty of the first fathers. Hasten to the goal which faith, love, and desire point out to you. Pass through life thinking of the nothingness of human glory. Use your power to defend and protect widows

[1] "Designastis ut quidquid de vestris vellemus, si notum vobis fieret, sine mora susciperemus . . . quod enim aurum, quæ gemmæ, quæ mundi hujus pretiosa mihi a te magis sunt exspectanda, quam vita casta, rerum tuarum in pauperes distributio, Dei et proximi dilectio, hæc a te munera optamus: ut integra et simplicia diligas nobilitatem tuam precamur."—Ep. vii. 26.

[2] "Scribe in corde tuo, quia summa regina cœli, quæ est decus et gloria omnium mulierum . . . imo salus et nobilitas omnium electorum. . . . Illa enim mulier vere apud Deum regina dicitur quæ mores suos in timore et amore Christi moderatur. Inde fit ut . . . multæ sæculares etiam reginæ, vel imperatrices apud Deum et homines nec bonam famam valere mereantur. Rogamus ergo te et præcipimus ut semper studeas animum domini tui regis et carissimi filii nostri. . . ."—Ep. viii. 22.

[3] Matt. viii. 11.

and orphans, and not only love righteousness, but serve her with all your energies."[1]

What, however, is particularly shown in Gregory's correspondence is the inner nature of his soul.[2] There we find his ruling passion—charity,—and the only fear which he ever knew—the fear of violating justice[3] and of compromising his salvation. "I say with the prophet," he wrote to the Countesses Beatrice and Matilda, "'Offer the sacrifice of righteousness and hope in the Lord.'[4] I place the defence of the miserable and oppressed as much above prayers, vigils, fasts, and other good works, as I rank charity, with the apostle, above all other virtues." And elsewhere: "We are placed above the other men who are confided to our care, much less to show them our power than our justice.[5] It is far safer for us to resist even to blood in defence of virtue, than to risk our eternal safety by complying with iniquity. It is safer for us to die braving the power of the wicked, than to betray poor Christians who love their God, obey His law, and prefer righteousness to life."[6]

[1] "De ultimis finibus estis; sed si curritis, si festinatis, primis patribus in regno sociati eritis. Sit cursus vester fides amor et desiderium. Sit iter vestrum mundi gloriam assidue meditari esse caducam. . . . Sit vestræ potentiæ usus et exercitatio, subvenire oppressis . . . justitiam non solum diligere, sed etiam tota virtute defendere."—Ep. vi. 13.

[2] The Pope no longer releases from the oath of fidelity, but nations release themselves; they revolt, they dethrone their princes, they send them to the scaffold; they do yet worse—they say to them, "You suit us no longer, go!"—De Maistre, *Du pape*, book ii. c. 2, written and published in 1817. We see that the great man was not only, as has been said of him, a prophet of the past.

[3] He valued justice as much in others as in himself: what made him prefer William the Conqueror to all other princes was his love of justice (Ep. iv. 18); and among the Germans he acknowledged no partisans but those who loved justice and the chair of St. Peter (Ep. vi. 14).

[4] "Sacrificate sacrificium justitiæ, et sperate in Domino."—Psalm iv.; Ep. i. 50.

[5] "Neque ad hoc prælati sumus, ut nostræ commissos providentiæ potenter magis quam juste tractemus."—Ep. i. 81.

[6] "Certe tutius nobis est defendendo veritatem pro sui ipsius salute ad usque sanguinem nostrum sibi resistere, quam ad explendam ejus volun-

Gregory ends the letter just quoted with these fine words, "To abandon righteousness is to shipwreck the soul."[1] "My greatest fear," he wrote to the Germans, "is to be accused before the Supreme Judge of neglect in the administration of my office."[2] Then, addressing the Duke of Bohemia, "It is God," he says, "who urges and threatens me by His prophet Ezekiel, when he says, 'If thou dost not warn the wicked, he shall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thy hand.'"[3] "I am ready in all things to moderate the rigour of the doctrine of the holy fathers, except in what touches the honour of the King Eternal or endangers souls."[4] "I will do for King Henry all that justice or mercy permit me to do without peril to my soul or his."

We may remark that this reservation is the same which the Pope had already made in regard to Robert Guiscard, the only defender the Holy See possessed, and with whom it was so important to keep on good terms.[5]

St. Gregory's tenderness of heart was displayed, above all, in his intercourse with Beatrice and Matilda—those brave and noble princesses to whom he justly gave the name of daughters of St. Peter, his true sisters,[6] whom he remem-

tatem iniquitati consentiendo secum, quod absit, ad interitum ruere."—Ep. i. 11. "Mori tutius est quam legem ejus (Christi) derelinquere, aut pro mundi gloria impiorum potius, si sint potentes, quam eorum personas respicere, qui, licet sint pauperes, legem sui conditoris exquirunt, mandata diligunt, vitam potius quam justitiam deserunt."—Ep. ii. 12.

[1] "Cum nobis. . . . Deserere justitiam, animæ, sit naufragium."—Ep. i. 39.

[2] "Urgente me, præ omnibus, cum eo timore, ne susceptæ me apud supernum Judicem negligentia dispensationis accuset."—Ep. i. 39.

[3] "Per Ezechielem namque prophetam sub interminatione nostri interitus impellimur dicentem: *Si non annuntiaveris iniquo iniquitatem suam, ipse iniquus in iniquitate sua morietur; sanguinem autem ejus de manu tua requiram.*"—Ep. i. 17.

[4] "In quo salvo æterni Regis honore, et sine periculo animarum nostrarum . . . temperare possemus . . . eorum consiliis condescenderemus."—Ep. iii. 10.

[5] "Sicut et te agere et me suscipere decet sine periculo animæ tuæ et meæ."—Act of investiture, inserted in the *Regis.*, b. viii. Ep. 1 and 2.

[6] "Sicut sororum nostrarum et filiarum sancti Petri."—Ep. ii. 9.

bered every day in his prayers,[1] and who recalled to him the holy women of the Gospel at the tomb of the Saviour, when they came with pious love to seek, as it were, the captive and buried Church in the sepulchre of affliction, and to labour for the resurrection of her freedom.[2] The Pope wrote in all the frankness of spiritual fatherhood, and with that warm and confiding affection which served as a pretext for calumny:[3] "We shall have to give account to you of our actions, and thus give you the most certain proof of the force of the affection which binds us to you.[4] Adieu, dearly beloved friends in Christ, know that we hold you in the depths of our heart—chained, as it were, to our love."[5] Finally, in this correspondence is betrayed the secret of those sublime sufferings, the disgust of life, the passing sadness of a great mind overwhelmed by the weight of anguish, which sometimes threw him into despair, but always ended by changing into passionate aspirations towards heaven. "I am cured," he wrote to the two countesses; "I have recovered from a serious illness beyond all hope, and I am sorry for it. For my soul was sighing for that celestial country where He who sees my sadness and my labour prepares rest and refreshment for my weariness. I am

[1] Ep. ii. 9.

[2] "Per vos illæ mulieres olim quærentes Dominum in monumento sæpe nobis ad memoriam redeunt . . . ita vos Ecclesiam Christi quasi in sepulcro afflictionis positam, præ multis, imo præ omnibus terrarum principibus, pro amore visitatis, et ut ad statum libertatis suæ resurgat, totis viribus connitentes," &c.—Ep. i. 85, to the Empress Agnes, who shared with the two illustrious countesses in his eulogies and in his affection.

[3] "Hæc est mulier illa, de qua ab obtrectatoribus fidei, et conculcatoribus veritatis crimen incestus sancto Pontifici objiciebatur. Cui si deessent meritorum laudes, hoc solum satis eam commendabilem redderet, quod cum tali viro, dum exprobratur, dum convicia suscipit, dum improperia audit, approbatur, honoratur, laudatur."—Hug. Flavin., p. 228.

[4] "Vobis rationem de factis nostris non inviti reddimus, in eodemque quanta vis dilectionis, qua vobis adstringimur, non alia vobis adhuc certiora signa dedimus."—Ep. i. 77.

[5] "Valete in Christo, carissimæ, et in nostra dilectione corde tenus vos annexas esse scitote."—Ep. i. 11.

given back to my accustomed toils, to my ceaseless cares, condemned to suffer daily like a mother in travail, yet without being able to save the Church from shipwreck."[1] To Hugh of Cluny he addressed these words: "How many times have I prayed to Jesus either to take me out of this world, or to make me of use to our common mother! and, nevertheless, He has not yet released me from my tribulations, and my life has not yet been of any use to that mother whose bonds He has willed should be chains also for me.[2] A sea of troubles encompasses me on all sides; the Eastern Church has deserted the Catholic faith, and the devil already punishes her for having obeyed him, by causing her children to be massacred by the barbarians, as if to prevent their repentance. If I look to the West, to the North, to the South, everywhere it is hard to find bishops who are legitimate by their appointment and by their morals; among all secular princes I know none who prefer God's glory to their own, and uprightness to gain. The Romans, the Lombards, and these Normans among whom I live, are in some ways, as I often tell them, worse than Jews and pagans. . . . Between a daily renewed grief, and a hope too often, alas! disappointed, beaten by a thousand storms, I live as always dying. I wait for Him who has bound me with His fetters, who has carried me back, in my own despite, to this Rome, where unwillingly I have spent twenty years; I cry to Him perpetually, 'Hasten, do not delay! Set me free, for the love of the Blessed Mary and of St. Peter.[3] . . . If thou hadst laid

[1] "Tendebat anima nostra, et toto desiderio ad illam patriam anhelabat, in qua Ille, qui laborem et dolorem considerat, lassis quietem et refrigerium præstat. Verum reservat adhuc . . . in singulas horas, quasi parturientis dolores et angustias patimur, dum pene in oculis nostris naufragantem Ecclesiam nullo valemus eripere gubernaculo."—Ep. ii. 9.

[2] "Tamen de magna tribulatione adhuc non eripuit, neque vita mea prædictæ matri, cujus me catenis alligavit, ut sperabam profuit."—Ep. ii. 49.

[3] "Circumvallat enim me dolor immanis et tristitia universalis, . . .

so great a burden upon Moses or upon Peter, I think it would have overwhelmed them. How, then, will it be with me, who, compared to them, am nothing? It must needs be, O Jesus, that Thou Thyself, with Thy Peter, guide the pontificate, or that Thou consent to see Thy servant fall and the pontificate fall with him.'" [1]

Happily the great Pope knew a remedy for so many distresses: all the treasures of the spiritual life were open to him, for he never ceased to take refuge in prayer, until he was able to cry, "O Jesus, Divine Consoler, true God and true man, when Thou holdest out a hand to my misery Thou givest me back joy; but of myself I am ever dying, and only find a few moments of life in Thee!" [2]

Convinced that the defeats of the good cause resulted only from the sins of its defenders,[3] Gregory VII. regarded the prayers of pure souls as his best auxiliaries; he begged, therefore, those of the monks of Cluny,[4] those of the community of Bec, and of Abbot Anselm,[5] who was soon to

Romæ, in qua coactus, Deo teste, jam a viginti annis inhabitavi. . . . Inter dolorem, quæ quotidie in me renovatur, et spem quæ nimis, heu! protenditur, mille quassatus tempestatibus quoquomodo moriens vivo.

"Etenim qui me suis allegavit vinculis, et Romam invitum reduxit, illicque mille angustiis præcinxit exspecto. Cui frequenter dico: Festina, ne tardaveris . . . meque libera amore B. Mariæ et S. Petri."—Ep. ii. 49.

[1] "Frequenter hæc vita nobis est tædio, et mors carnis desiderio. . . . Ad illum gemens clamo: Si Moysi et Petro . . . restat ergo ut aut tu ipse cum tuo Petro pontificatum regas, aut me succumbere, et eumdem pontificatum confundi cernas."—Ep. v. 21; also to Hugh.

[2] "Cum pauperi Jesus, ille pius consolator . . . manum perrigit, valde tristem et afflictum lætificat . . . in me quippe semper morior, sed in eo interdum vivo, et cum viribus omnino deficio."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Quoniam nihil in terra sine causa fit . . . quod dudum sancta Ecclesia fluctuum procellarumque mole concutitur, quodque tyrannicæ percussionis hactenus rabiem patitur, non nisi nostris peccatis exigentibus evenire credendum est."—Ep. viii. 9, ad Germanos.

[4] "Precor, exoro, rogo ut eos qui merentur audiri pro vitæ meritis, rogites . . . ut pro me Deum exorent ea caritate . . . qua debent universalem diligere matrem."—Ep. ii. 49.

[5] "Credentes pro certo. . . . Ecclesiam Dei . . . tuis similiumque tui

follow so gloriously in his footsteps. With what enthusiasm does he quote words of encouragement drawn from the Fathers, when he recommends frequent communion to the Countess Matilda! "One who has received a wound seeks the remedy: our wound is sin; our remedy the divine sacrament. As a woman is urged by nature to nourish with her milk the child to whom she has given birth, thus Christ constantly nourishes with His blood those to whom He has given regeneration."[1]

Whether he had, for the second time, to fulminate a sentence against the sovereign of Germany, or whether he felt the need of pouring out his heart in the secrecy of correspondence, with what tender and humble confidence did he invoke the help of the Queen of heaven![2] How ardently did he pray that the salvation of Matilda might be the special care of her whom he regarded as the highest, the holiest, the best of protectresses, the gentlest mother of sinners, the most ready to help them in their fall, and to respond to their love![3]

This tender devotion to our Lady procured for him in sickness more than one vision in which the mother of God revealed to him, by salutary warnings, the way to perfection.[4]

precibus etiam ab instantibus periculis Christi subveniente misericordia posse eripi."—*Inter epist. S. Anselmi*, vol. ii. No. 31.

[1] "Qui vulnus habet, medicinam requirit. Vulnus est quia sub peccato sumus. . . . Sicut mulier affectionis natura cogente genitum alere sui lactis fecunditate festinat, sic et Christus quos ipse regenerat suo sanguine semper enutrit."—Quotations from St. Ambrose and St. John Chrysostom in Ep. i. 47.

[2] See the Acts of the Councils of Rome from 1076 to 1080; and Ep. iv. 1, to the Germans; vi. 14, to Duke Wolf of Bavaria; viii. 22, to a queen; ix. 2, to King Alfonso of Castile, and elsewhere.

[3] "De matre vero Domini, cui te principaliter commisi et committo et nunquam committere omittam . . . quanto altior et melior ac sanctior est omni matre, tanto clementior et dulcior circa conversos peccatores et peccatrices. . . . Invenies illam promptiorem carnali matre, et mitiorem in dilectione tui. . . ."—Ep. i. 47, to Matilda.

[4] PAUL BERNRIED, i. 32, 33. The Holy Virgin told him that she had intended to call him to the company of virgins in Paradise, but that he had lost his right to this favour, because, when his niece visited him

This is one of the tokens and privileges of saintship which the Church commands us to recognise in Gregory VII.

Supernatural cures worked by the intercession of the Pontiff, and other miracles, attested this saintship to his contemporaries from his youth to his death.[1] It is related, among other facts, that while he was celebrating mass at Monte Cassino, where he had been taken by Robert Guiscard, towards the close of his life,[2] two peasants came to look at him. While they followed all the movements of the Pope with ardent curiosity, suddenly one of them fell into an ecstasy, and saw a white dove with a golden breast descend from heaven, alight upon Gregory's right shoulder, and spreading its wings over his head, plunge its beak into the chalice which he had just consecrated.[3] The thrice-repeated apparition of St. Peter to this same peasant induced him to relate his vision to Gregory himself, in order to excite him to persevere in his work by the aid of the Holy Spirit.[4] The Pope, amidst the burden of secular affairs, coming from all corners of the world, had sometimes ecstasies which delivered him for the moment from his load, and transported him in fancy to the bosom of Paradise. When he was able

during a severe illness, he had asked the young girl, while playing with her necklace, when she meant to marry. "Ut nepti animæ suæ super ægritudine sua levigaret, monilia ejusdem manu tenens, an nubere vellet requisivit."

[1] "Signa etiam et prodigia, quæ per orationes papæ frequentius fiebant, et zelus ejus ferventissimus pro Deo et Ecclesiasticis legibus, satis eum contra venenatas detractorum linguas communiebant."—LAMBERT. SCHAFN., ann. 1077. Cf. PAUL BERNRIED, c. 7 and 35.

[2] This is the version given by Baronius in the *Chron. of Monte Cassino*, b. iii. c. 54. Paul Bernried, c. 30, places the miracle at the Lateran, and the date immediately after the accession of the Pope.

[3] "Duo rustici, non improbabili curiositate ducti. . . . Alter eorum, velut in extasin raptus, vidit columbam, de cœlo descendere humeroque dextro Gregorii insidentem alis extensis caput ejus velare, completo canone . . . calici rostrum, ut sibi visum est, immisit."—PAUL BERNRIED, i. c. "Vir quidam, Johannes nomine livei coloris columbam, cujus guttur videbatur esse aureum. . . ."—PETR. DIAC., I, c.

[4] "Vade, quantocius auribus Papæ hoc ipsum intimato, ut constanter vigore S. Spiritus cœptum opus peragat."—*Ibid.*

to enjoy some hours of solitude, celestial visions came immediately to temper and refresh his soul.[1] These supernatural privileges changed in no way the humility which formed, as it were, the very groundwork of his character, but which never hindered his efforts to merit heaven. The Pontiff's fervent devotion sought eagerly that gift of tears accompanying prayer, which, as contemporary historians attest, was so dear to medieval piety.[2] We must add, as a last touch to the moral portrait of the great Pope, that he shrank from none of the minute penances of cloistral life; that having mounted the pontifical throne, he kept his body in subjection by fasts, vigils, and the use of discipline, like the lowest of monks;[3] and that this hero, this giant among the soldiers of the faith, this conqueror, whose name has filled the world, had learned to rule his will, and even his most innocent inclinations, to the point of depriving himself of certain vegetables—such as pears and onions—because he took too much pleasure in eating them.[4] Thus it must not be forgotten that it is not only a great man but a great saint that Catholics venerate in Gregory VII. It is not enough to admire and bless his memory; we have a right also to implore and to claim his intercession with God. For his name, after having shone with unequalled splendour in the pages of history, has been inscribed by the Church in that most glorious book ever given to man to write—in the Martyrology.[5]

[1] "In ipsis sæcularibus negotiis sæpius excessit mente, exhilarato spiritu suo cœlesti contemplatione: qui si privatus interdum existeret, revelationibus etiam divinis jucundatus est et confortatus."—*Vit. S. Anselm. Lucens.*, c. 3, in *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix. p. 473.

[2] PAUL BERNRIED, cc. 32 and 33.

[3] "Completis itaque duarum hebdomadarum vigiliis, jejunio et corporali disciplina."—PAUL BERNRIED, c. 32, ap. *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix.

[4] It is St. Peter Damianus who tells us this in a letter addressed to Gregory: "Ipse mihi nuper confessus es quoniam ideo te funditus purrorum sive cœparum perceptione compescis, quia videlicet his acuminibus uberius delectaris."—*Opusc.* 33, c. 1.

[5] This is how he is mentioned in the Roman Martyrology: "*Salerni;*

To one who studies the course of centuries from a Catholic point of view, it signifies much less to note the material successes of the Church, than to make clear the ever-abiding presence of the supernatural power of faith, the triumph of Christian opinion, the maintenance of the soul's dignity and purity, in the great events and great representatives of her history. Nowhere is this delight of the faithful heart more complete than in reading the life of Gregory VII. In him, indeed, reached its highest point the divine independence of the soul bought by the blood of a God as opposed to the powers of the world and the devil. And we do not fear to affirm that it is this, above all, which is to be noted in that famous interview at Canossa, where the young and splendid representative[1] of imperial power, and of the greatest lay sovereignty of Europe, was forced to prostrate himself in all the humility of Christian penance before a little old man of low birth[2] who governed the Church of God. Certain recent apologists of the papacy have wished to see in this the triumph of the Southern race over the Northern, which had so long been the oppressor, of civilisation over the barbarous world, of intelligence over material force. But why should we suffer a false and profane pride to lessen the true majesty of such a spectacle? . . . Let us dare to say that this was a victory independent of all questions of race, of time, or earthly rivalries,—a victory such as the Church has won by thousands, though with less brilliancy—such as the lowest of priests or the most ignorant of monks may still gain every day;—that is to say, a victory of humility over

depositio Beati Gregorii papæ septimi Ecclesiasticæ libertatis propugnatoris ac defensoris acerrimi."

[1] Henry IV. was then twenty-six years of age: "In turba procerum cœteris eminentior et major seipso videbatur . . . in vultu terribile quoddam decus præferebat."—ALBERTI LEODIENS. epist. de *Vit. Henr. IV.*, ap. GOLDASTI, *Apolog.*, pro Imp.

[2] "Homuncio exilis staturæ."—WILL. MALM., *De gestis reg.*, b. iii. p. 60. "Quanquam statura pusillus esset."—LABB., *Concil., Vit. Gregorii VII.*, vol. xii. p. 230, ed. COLETTI.

pride, of a vigorous and upright conscience over violence for a moment disarmed, of the soul obedient to God over rebellious human nature, of Christian duty over earthly passion; in a word, a victory of all those supernatural powers which eternally constitute the divine independence of the Church over all the cunning and all the violence of her enemies.

In his lifetime Gregory knew little success, except of a purely spiritual kind; and this he bought at the cost of trials and disappointments the hardest and most bitter, and which were constantly repeated till the end of his days. He foresaw this, and accepted it beforehand: "If I had been willing," he often said, "to let the princes and great ones of the world reign by the guidance of their passions; if I had been silent when I saw them trample under foot God's justice; if, at the peril of their souls and of mine, I had concealed their crimes; if I had not had righteousness and the honour of the holy Church at heart, ah! . . . I might better have counted upon submission, wealth, repose, and homage more surely than could any of my predecessors. But knowing that a bishop is never more a bishop than when he is persecuted for right's sake, I resolved to brave the hatred of the wicked by obeying God rather than provoke His anger by guilty complaisance towards them. As to their threats and their cruelty, I pay no regard to them, being always ready to die rather than consent to partake of their iniquity and betray the good cause."[1]

[1] "Si principibus et divitibus terræ vestræ regnare pro libidine, et justitiam Dei conculcare taciti consentire vellemus, profecto amicitias, munera, subjectiones, laudem, et magnificas ab eis honorificentias habere possemus."—Ep. ii. 12, to the Bishop of Halberstadt. "Peccatorem me esse, sicut verum est, confiteri minime piget. Verum si causa odii vel detractionis eorum qui in nos fremunt, subtiliter investigetur, profecto non tam alicujus iniquitatis meæ intuitu, quam ex veritatis assertione, injustitiæque contradictione, illos in nos exarcisse patebit. Quorum quidem servitia et largissima munera, nos satis abundantius multis antecessoribus nostris habere potuimus, si ad periculum illorum et nostrum, veritatem silere, malitiamque ipsorum dissimulare maluissemus. At nos

Gregory kept his word to the end, as is testified by his last utterance on his bed of death at Salerno, 25th May 1085, the day of St. Urban, Pope and martyr. "My beloved brothers," he said to the cardinals and bishops who surrounded him, "I account my trials as nothing, and place my confidence in one thing only—that is, that I have always loved righteousness and hated iniquity; yet it is for this that I die in exile."[1] To which a bishop answered: "My lord, you cannot die in exile, for, as the representative of Christ and His apostles, you have received the nations as your inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for your possession."[2]

The bishop was right; Gregory's was no exile. His was a death worthy of such a champion, the seal of a victory which posterity alone could value rightly; for we may boldly affirm that he would have chosen well even if he had not foreseen the earthly triumph of his cause. Even if he had been vanquished, even if he gathered no fruit of his courage but defeat and exile, his glory would not have been lessened. But he succeeded; and the annals of the

certe (ex hujus vitæ termino et temporalium commodorum qualitate) perpendentes nunquam melius quanquam posse Episcopum nominari, quam quum persecutionem patitur propter justitiam, decrevimus potius divinis mandatis obtemperando pravorum inimicitias incurrere, quam illis male placendo iram Dei provocare."—Ep. ix. 2, to the King of Castile. "Tu ipse, amande frater, cognoscis quia si nos amor justitiæ et honoris Ecclesiæ non teneret . . . nullus aliquando antecessorum meorum . . . tam amplum et devotum servitium . . . habere potuerunt. Verum quoniam illorum minas et sævitiam pro nihilo ducimus, magis, si necesse erit, mortem suscipere parati erimus, quam impietatibus eorum assensum præbere aut justitiam relinquere."—Ep. ix. 11, to the Abbot of Monte Cassino.

[1] "Ego, fratres mei dilectissimi, nullos labores meos alicujus momenti facio, in hoc solummodo confidens quia semper dilexi justitiam et odi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio."—Part of the phrase is borrowed from Psalm xliv.

[2] "Quidam venerabilis episcopus: Non potes, Domine, mori in exilio, qui vice Christi et apostolorum ejus divinitus accepisti gentes hæreditatem et possessionem terminos terræ."—PAUL BERNRIED, *Vit. Gregor.*, 12, ap. Bolland., p. 140.

most remarkable earthly contests have guarded the memory of no success more complete and durable than his. He found the Church degraded within, enslaved without; he at once purified and freed her. Thanks to him, the marriage of the clergy, at the moment when it was about to become a general law, disappeared; and this principle, so vulnerable in all men commissioned to teach the truth, has never been seriously attacked since his time: he made celibacy the imperishable heritage of the Catholic priesthood. Thanks to him, simony was solemnly proscribed, and though constantly disguising herself under a thousand perfidious shapes, has been completely extirpated from the bosom of the Church. Thanks to him, but only after fifty years of a war begun by his decrees and directed by his genius, the institution of bishops, the true basis of ecclesiastical government, ceased to be confounded with lay investiture; above all, thanks to him, the independence of pontifical elections, annulled during two centuries by imperial usurpation, was guaranteed for all time.[1]

After his pontificate, the consent of the emperors was neither asked nor even offered, but he left to his successors a throne which they might mount without any human power daring to enervate and discredit their authority by claiming to control it. He left them yet more—the most magnificent example of that mysterious and immortal force, always ignored by persecutors, because veiled under the sacred weakness of the Church, which survives them all,

[1] "Ita plane persecutionibus indesinentibus, diversi generis ærumnis, atque sæpe cædibus sacerdotum multo felicius paritur Ecclesiæ pax, libertas acquiritur atque confirmatur Ecclesiastica, et salus quæritur animarum. Sic sacerdotes suos pugnare et vincere Christus docuit, cujus passionibus et infirmitatibus robur ac fortitudo, ac morte denique vita est fidelibus comparata. Mentiar nisi ista jam experimento rerum præsentium monstrari possint, per Gregorium nempe vindicatas e manibus principum Ecclesiarum investituras, liberam electionem Romanorum pontificum postliminio restitutans, disciplinam Ecclesiasticam collapsam penitus reparatam, et alia immunera bona parta."—BARONIUS, *Ann.*, ad. ann. 1085.

which they never provoke with impunity, and which always flashes out at the most unforeseen moment, to confound their cunning and exhaust their violence. In all these things Gregory VII. triumphed, and his triumph has lasted to our days. The only point where his work has not endured, although continued with equal courage and constancy by his successors through three centuries,—the only point where the future has not completely justified him,—has been in the establishment of the power of supreme arbitration between kings and people [1]—a power which the greatest minds have always desired and admired, and which he believed that he drew honestly from the example of his predecessors, from the unanimous consent of Christian nations, and from the political and religious constitution of the society of his time. But he never pretended to bind the conscience of Christians by any solemn decree [2] on the subject of this power, which might be a benefit for temporal society, but was not absolutely necessary either to the authority or liberty of the Church. After having willingly recognised and invoked it, first kings, and then their subjects, thought well to refuse the maternal jurisdiction which the Church has now for a long time ceased to exercise or even to claim: kings have shaken off the yoke of those ideas and beliefs which rendered them amenable to the Church; but as all earthly sovereignty needs a bridle—and, thanks to heaven, this bridle will never be wanting—others have set themselves up as judges of princes. As to the nations, they have united, in agreement with their masters, to overthrow the barrier which the Church had raised between the weak and the strong, and we are assured that it is a happiness and a progress for the whole of

[1] Henry IV. of France and Leibnitz. See the latter's remarkable opinion in his *Tractatus de jure suprematus*, quoted by Gosselin, pp. 471 and 511; and his *Lettres à M. Grimaret.*

[2] This is acknowledged by Fleury himself: *Discours sur l'histoire Ecclesiastique*, from A.D. 600 to 1100; 9, 18.

society to have silenced that grand voice which spoke so loudly to monarch and to subject. Is it so in truth? The scaffold of Louis XVI., the partition of Poland, and the French Revolution, may bear witness for the one and for the other what they have gained by it.

BOOK XX

THE PREDECESSORS OF CALIXTUS II.

"Omnis pontifex ex hominibus assumptus, pro hominibus constituitur in iis quæ sunt ad Deum, ut offerat dona et sacrificia pro peccatis : qui condolere possit iis qui ignorant et errant, quoniam et ipse circumdatus est infirmitate."—HÆBR. v. 1, 2.

CHAPTER I

VICTOR III., URBAN II., PASCAL II., AND GELASIUS II.

Robert Guiscard and Anselm of Lucca soon follow Gregory VII. to the tomb.—Abbot Didier, of Monte Cassino, appointed Pope under the name of Victor III.—Heroism of the Countess Matilda.—Norman princes in Sicily remain faithful to the Holy See.—French monks assist in the Catholic restoration of Spain.—Henry IV. defeated at Bleichsseld, August 10, 1086.—Death of Burkhard, Bishop of Halberstadt.—Henry IV. rejects the offer of peace made by the Catholic princes.—Beautiful letter of the Count of Thuringia to the Archbishop of Magdeburg.—Manegald, the monk, reconciles Alsace with the Holy See.—Unsuitable marriage of Countess Matilda to Duke Welf.—Urban II. restores the Sicilian churches, and makes that of Pisa metropolitan.—St. Bruno founds the Order of Carthusians.—His death.—The Lombard towns take up arms against Henry IV.—Great distress of the Pope, who is succoured by Geoffrey of Anjou.—Public confession of the Empress Adelaide at the Council of Placentia.

GREGORY died at Salerno, on the day of St. Urban, pope and martyr (25th May 1085). They buried him beside the relics of St. Matthew the apostle and evangelist, for whom he had always had a special veneration. He was mourned by the poor,[1] the monks,[2] the Normans,[3] and all who had been his allies before God and man. Robert

[1] "De cujus obitu omnes religiosi utriusque sexus, et maxime pauperes, doluerunt."—BERTH. CONST., *Chron.*, ad ann. 1085.

[2] "Nunc monachi flerunt, monachus quia noscitur esse."
—DOMNIZO, *in Math.*, ii. 3.

[3] "Dux non se lacrymis audita forte coercet
Morte viri tanti : non mors patris amplius illum
Cogeret ad lacrymas. . . .
. . . Quia magnus amoris
Vivere dum licuit, nexus conjunxerat illos," &c.
—GUILL. APULIENS., b. v. p. 277, ap. MURAT.

Guiscard, who had loved him as a son, with a constant and dutiful love, died a few months after him,[1] at the end of a victorious campaign against the Greek schismatics. He was buried, as befitted a champion of his time and his race, in a Benedictine abbey which he had founded at Venusia.[2] This great blow did not shake the cause of the Church. Gregory, in dying, did not leave an empire to be shared among his lieutenants: he had founded, in the breast of Christendom, a spirit henceforth imperishable; he had taught all Catholics, all pure and generous hearts, to ally themselves against traitors and oppressors; he had created of these chosen ones an army which might be often defeated, but would never be annihilated. Thus the death of this great man brought about no triumph for his enemies, no defection among the champions of the Church.

Meanwhile the dangers remained unaltered, and the human means of opposing them were insignificant. The death of Robert Guiscard seemed to expose the new-born sovereignty of the Normans to the dangers of a divided succession. Rome was, in fact, in the hands of the imperialists; in Germany the Catholic party had but an inefficient head in its elected king, Hermann of Luxemburg. The first need of the Church was to find a worthy successor for Gregory VII. He had, on his deathbed, named four monks as candidates, whose zeal and courage he had known how to value: first, Didier, Abbot of Monte Cassino; then Hugh, Abbot of Cluny; Odo, a monk of the same monastery, Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia; and Anselm, also a monk of the rule of Cluny, and Bishop of Lucca.[3]

For the first time then, for several centuries, the bishops and cardinals were able to proceed to the election of the supreme pontiff without regard to the imperial power, and

[1] At Cephalonia, July 17, 1085. Robert had distinguished himself, as became a Norman knight and ally of St. Gregory VII., by great liberality towards Monte Cassino.

[2] *Historia Roberti Guiscardi*, ed. Champollion, p. 320. 1835.

[3] Leo Ostiens., b. iii. c. 64.

thus to put a definitive seal to Gregory's great victory. Obedient to his voice and to his dying wish, the prelates chose the Abbot of Monte Cassino; and in spite of Didier's absolute refusal, they undertook, in agreement with the Norman princes, to oblige him to accept their election. This resolution was fortified by the death of the holiest of the candidates for the papacy—of Anselm of Lucca—to whom Gregory, when dying, had bequeathed his mitre, as a presage of the future.[1] Anselm, the minister and confessor of the Great Countess, had been, after Hildebrand, the chief support of the orthodox in Italy; his benediction urged on the soldiers of Matilda to victory[2]—his holiness attached them to duty, by conquering worldly passions in their hearts;[3] and his zeal for ecclesiastical regularity forced him to declare that it would be better for the Church to have neither clergy nor monks than to have irregular ones.[4] The example and affection of Gregory had alone been able to console Anselm for having to abandon his monastic retreat and face the storms of the world.[5] Deprived of such a guide and friend, Anselm felt the sources of his life dry up,[6] and he quickly followed to heaven. He died at Mantua, 18th March, exhorting the cardinals, bishops, and knights gathered round his bed, to remain always faithful to the doctrine of the blessed Gregory, whose last words he de-

[1] "Ille moriens mitram capitis sui transmisit isti, quasi potestatem suam ligandi et solvendi, sed et miraculi, credo faciendi."—*Act. SS. O. B.* ix. 481. He died on 18th March 1086; he was nephew of Pope Alexander II.

[2] *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix. p. 479.

[3] "Milites domus illius, etsi nimium sæculares, in illum tamen respexerunt omnes, plus ipsum quam naturalem dominam metuentes."—*Ibid.*, p. 481.

[4] "Se malle ut in Ecclesia nullus esset vel clericus vel monachus, quam irregularis et irreligiosus."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Dum vitam rememoravit monasticam, quam se crebro deflevit amisisse, consolatus in eodem magistro est."—*Ibid.*, p. 482.

[6] "Ille fons erat: hic quasi rivus bonus ab illo fluebat et aridam irrigabat. Ille ut caput . . . iste, quasi manus studiosa . . . iste sicut sol. . . ."—*Vita*, c. 26.

lighted to repeat: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."[1]

Monks and bishops disputed for the body of him who had done equal honour to the cloister[2] and the episcopate; schismatics rejoiced in his death.[3] But the Church was not quite widowed of his virtues and his courage, for the miracles wrought at his tomb inspired in Catholic Italy new energy for the struggle with imperial tyranny.[4]

The voices of the faithful pointed unanimously to Didier, the antecedents of whose life offered all the guarantees desirable. Sprung from the blood of the ancient Lombard princes of Beneventum,[5] and nearly related to those of Salerno, he had early triumphed over all the seductions of the world. At twenty years of age, renouncing the brilliant marriage which his parents had provided for him as the only hope of their race, he one day left his servants, his horses, and his sword at the door of a church, and escaping by a private entrance, went to hide himself in a hermitage.[6] Dragged from this retreat, he resisted the tears of his mother and the violence of his family; and the Prince of Salerno conducted him—surrounded by all his relations and

[1] "Post omnia, dilexi justitiam," &c.—*Vita*, c. 32.

[2] Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, would not leave his body to the Abbey of Padolirone, where he had chosen his burial-place, because it was a dependency of Cluny, where he had been a monk.

[3] "De cujus vere tristantur morte fideles, schismatici gaudent."—DOMNIZO.

[4] "Fideles S. Petri contra tyrannidem Henrici adhuc in carne vivens multum incitavit, sed multo plus post obitum suum miraculis coruscans, eosdem contra eumdem persistere confortavit."—BERNOLD. ad ann. 1086. "Miraculis approbat quod sermone docebat. Omnes ergo qui in unitate catholica præceptis domni papæ Gregorii hactenus obedistis, gaudete et exsultate."—*Vita S. Anselmi*, c. 27.

[5] "Ex nobilissima Beneventanorum principum origine sanguinis lineam ducens."—LEO OST., *Chron. Cass.*, iii. 1.

[6] "Quadam die . . . quasi spatiandi gratia civitatem egressi . . . equos et gladium, quo tunc erat accinctus, famulis pro foribus veluti servanda relinquunt . . . puer tam nobilis, tam delicatus, tam dives, et præcipue parentibus singularis."—*Ibid.*, iii. c. 2.

the whole town, touched by so great a sacrifice—to the monastery of St. Sophia, which he had chosen as his retreat.[1] Being afterwards transferred to Monte Cassino, Didier there succeeded Pope Stephen IX. as abbot, and for twenty-eight years governed the greatest abbey in the world with a wisdom beyond comparison.

The vast labours of this holy monk for the restoration and embellishment of his famous monastery, had excited general admiration.[2] Though his father had fallen by the Norman sword, Didier was able to live in friendship with Richard and Robert Guiscard, the leaders in the new conquest of Sicily, and to exercise the most salutary influence over them. His relations with Henry IV. were marked with the double stamp of moderation and courage. The emperor, following the example of his predecessors, claimed a special right to the adhesion of the imperial abbey of Monte Cassino, and summoned the abbot to come and swear faith and homage to him. Didier obeyed the summons to avert greater evils, but declared that he would take no oath, either to save the abbey or to earn the greatest honours in the world. He urged, also, that Henry had not yet received the imperial crown; and that even when he should have done so, he, Didier, might reserve to himself liberty to choose between resignation and the oath demanded.[3]

The pious abbot only promised to aid Henry to become a legitimate emperor; and when they opposed to him a pretended diploma of Nicholas II., by which it was stipulated that no pope should be elected *without the imperial consent*,

[1] *Chron. Cass.*, iii. c. 5.

[2] We have spoken of this in the preceding book, where the reader may see the details given by Leo of Ostia and Peter Diaconus in b. iii. of *Chron. Cassin.*

[3] "Se non modo pro abbatia, sed nec pro honore totius mundi id minime esse facturum. . . . Cum Romani imperii coronam eum habere vidisset, tunc si sibi videretur, abbatiam ab ipso reciperet, si vero nollet dimitteret." —*Chron. Cass.*, iii. 50.

he replied that "the Roman Church was mistress and not servant; that she was superior to all; that no one had the right to sell her as a slave; that, if it had been possible for Pope Nicholas to execute the act of which they spoke, he would have committed an injustice and a folly; and that it was as impossible to allow that the dignity of the Church could have been compromised by the foolishness of a man without the good pleasure of God, as to believe *that a German king could ever in future be permitted to institute a pope at Rome.*" [1]

An imperialist bishop having replied to these words, that such language, if heard beyond the Alps, would raise the whole world against Didier, the latter declared that, "even if the whole universe should league together against him, nothing would make him change his opinion. No doubt the emperor, with God's permission, may have his way for a time, and do violence to ecclesiastical right; but he will never bring Catholics to sanction his deed." [2]

The man who thus avowed the principles proclaimed and maintained by Hildebrand, was clearly the one who was fittest to succeed him in the throne of St. Peter.

1 "Apostolica enim sedes domina nostra est, non ancilla . . . ut eam aliquis quasi famulam vendat. Quod si hoc a Nicolao papa factum est, injuste procul dubio et stultissime factum est; nec pro humana stultitia potest aut debet amittere suam dignitatem Ecclesia . . . nec, Deo volente, amplius fiet ut Rex Alemannorum Papam constituat Romanorum."—*Chron. Cass.*, iii. 1.

2 "Potest quidem imperator ad tempus, si tamen permiserit Deus, prævalere, et vim Ecclesiasticæ justitiæ inferre; nostrum tamen consensum ad hoc nunquam poterit inclinare."—*Ibid.* It does not appear that Didier ever had any other relations with Henry; yet Stentzel, with the usual good faith of Protestants, does not fear to affirm that his conduct was always equivocal, and opposed to the party of Gregory VII. The only trace of disagreement between the two pontiffs is found in the interdict which Gregory laid upon Monte Cassino to punish Didier for having allowed a Norman prince to carry off the treasure which was kept there. — *Ibid.*, iii. 46. The nomination of Didier by Gregory on his deathbed, shows that he had completely forgiven this act of weakness.

After a year of interregnum, being sent to Rome to supply the needs of the Church at the Pentecost of 1086, Didier became the object of the most ardent solicitations, and even violence, from the cardinals, clergy, and Catholics of Rome, who were determined to have him for pope.[1] But it was in vain that they knelt before him, weeping and imploring him not to abandon the Church to shipwreck;[2] the holy man replied, that being vowed to a solitary life, he wished to finish his pilgrimage as a monk, and pointed out to the suffrages of his colleagues the monk Odo, Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia. But as the Abbot of Monte Cassino was the only one whom the electors desired, they, driven to extremity, dragged him to the church of St. Lucia,[3] where, having proclaimed him under the name of Victor III., they succeeded in clothing him with the red cope, which was then part of the insignia of the papacy.[4] But, four days afterwards, the newly-elected pope fled from Rome; laid aside, at Terracina, all marks of pontifical dignity; and took refuge in his abbey, as he had already sworn to those who laid violent hands on him that he would do. There he remained a whole year, firmly resisting all the supplications of the faithful, until he was forced to surrender,[5] overcome by the urgency of the Norman princes, Jordan and Roger,[6] of Censius the prefect, and a part of the Roman nobles, who threw themselves at his feet at the Council of Capua. On Palm Sunday, 1087,

[1] "Et Romani omnes qui in fide catholici gregis perdurabant . . . episcopi et cardinales una cum clero et populo."—*Chron. Cass.*, iii. c. 66.

[2] "Multotiens ad genua ejus, nonnullis lacrymantibus, omnes pariter ruentes."—*Ibid.*

[3] "In Desiderii duritiam stomachantes . . . statuerunt violenter causam perficere. . . . Uno consensu et animo illum capientes, invitum et renitentem attrahunt."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Cappam quidem rubeam induebat, albam vero nunquam ei potuerunt induere."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Tandem cum dux et princeps . . . &c., flentes ejus pedibus adjacerent . . . coactus vix succubuit."—*Ibid.*, c. 68.

[6] Jordan was son of Richard, first Norman Prince of Capua; and Roger, the only son of Robert Guiscard.

the Normans brought the pontiff to Rome, and chased the partisans of the anti-Pope Guibert from the church of St. Peter, where the orthodox pope was consecrated and installed.[1] Eight days after his consecration, the friend of Gregory VII., already consumed by the malady which was soon to carry him off, returned to his monastery, but was almost immediately recalled to Rome by the Countess Matilda, who came to salute the successor of the great pope, whom she had so nobly defended. This famous princess, daughter of Marquis Boniface of Tuscany, and widow of Duke Godfrey of Lorraine, was, for ten years, the sole ruler of Tuscany, Lombardy, and Liguria, the vast domains of which her mother Beatrice, at her death, had left her the administration.[2] During more than half a century these two illustrious women gave to the service of the Church not only their power and their soldiers, but also a most masculine vigour, tempered by profound humility. Beatrice, who asked that on her tomb, before

[1] The Sunday after Ascension, 9th May.

[2] Beatrice, daughter of Frederic, Duke of Upper Lorraine, and of Matilda of Suabia, sister-in-law of the Emperor Conrad II., was descended on both sides from the blood of Charlemagne; in 1036 she married Boniface of Tuscany, by whom she had the great Countess Matilda, and who left her the enjoyment of his States. In 1063 she married Godfrey with the Beard, Duke of Lorraine, whose death we have elsewhere related, and who strongly opposed the imperial supremacy both in Germany and in Italy, and rendered important services to Popes Nicholas II. and Alexander II., although he has been suspected of having been led by views of personal ambition foreign to the noble nature of his wife and stepdaughter. Godfrey had, by a former marriage, one son, Godfrey the Hunchback, whom he and Beatrice married in 1065 to Matilda, born in 1046, and now become, by the early death of her brother, the sole heir of Marquis Boniface. This double alliance, between Godfrey with the Beard and Beatrice on one hand, and their children Godfrey the Hunchback and Matilda on the other, was of the utmost importance to the independence of the Church, since it united in the same hands distant States, such as Lorraine and Tuscany, one of which gave access to Germany, and the other formed a centre of resistance to the imperial power in Italy. But the conjugal union of Matilda and the second Godfrey turned out ill; the prince allied himself with Henry IV., and died assassinated in 1076.—See *Dissert.* on Beatrice and Matilda in Muratori and St. Marc, *History of Italy*, vol. iv. pp. 1298–1315.

all her other titles, should be inscribed that of *sinner*,[1] was worthy to be the mother of Matilda, all whose public documents commenced thus: "I, Matilda, by the grace of God what I am," &c.[2] Beautiful, accomplished, learned even, for her time, especially in languages,[3] yet excelling priests or bishops in piety,[4] the countess commanded the respect and admiration of her contemporaries. Nearly all North Italy was subject to her.[5] Her strict justice placed a salutary check on the small tyrants who sheltered their violence under the imperial flag.[6] Round her, as in a tranquil harbour, bishops, monks, and Catholics, of all ranks and of all countries, exiled or despoiled by German oppression, found a refuge; she often fed and clothed them with her own hands.[7]

[1] "Quamvis peccatrix, sum domna vocata Beatrix.
In tumulo missa jaceo quæ comitissa."

In the Campo Santo of Pisa is still seen the mausoleum, which bears this inscription, "encore plus grossière que simple," as says the Gallican philosopher St. Marc.—*Hist. d'Italie.*

[2] *Mathildis, Dei gratia id quod sum,* or *si quid est,* or *quidquid est.*"

[3] "Russi, Saxones, Guascones atque Frisones,
Arverni, Franci, Lotharingi quoque, Britanni
Hanc tantum noscunt, quod ei sua plurima poscunt . . .
Omnibus ex istis equites habet alta Mathildis.
Responsum cunctis hæc dat sine murmure turbis . . .
Hæc Apices dictat, scit teutonicam bene linguam;
Hæc loquitur quin francigenamque loquelam. . . .
Libros ex cunctis habet artibus atque figuris. . . ."
—DOMNIZO, b. ii., Prol. and c. 20.

[4] "Ista sacerdotes de Christi vincit amore . . .
Nullus ea præsul studiosior invenietur. . . ."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Ad instar fortissimi principis totam terram illam suo dominio subjugavit."—*Chr. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1125.

[6] "Stabant o quanti crudeles atque tyranni
Sub specie justa, noscentes hanc fore justam!"
—DOMNIZO, *in fine.*

[7] "Catholicis prorsus fuit hæc tutus quasi portus.
Nam quos damnabat rex, pellebat, spoliabat
Pontifices, monachos, clericos, Italos, quoque Gallos;
Ad vivum fontem currebant funditus omnes,
Scilicet ad dictam dominam tam mente benignam . . .
Vestibus e sacris multos hæc nota ducatrix
Patres catholicos vestisse quidem reminiscor."—*Ibid.*, ii. 4.

She herself, with knightly courage, led her soldiers to battle against the enemies of the Church,[1] for she hated them with the perfect hatred spoken of by the Psalmist.[2] Alone in Italy, until the definite alliance of the Normans with the Church was concluded, she succeeded in resisting Henry IV., defeating his artifices, and triumphing over his military enterprises.[3] It was at her residence at Canossa, and in her presence, that unrighteous power, personified in Henry IV., was for a moment prostrated before the justice and the majesty of the Church. Associated with the glory[4] and the virtues of Gregory, she was associated also in the calumnies invented against the holy pontiff by ignoble adversaries, on account of the affection which existed between her and him.[5] Time cleared away this ignominy, and Matilda continued to the Church, widowed of her great shepherd, the same love she had shown to Gregory. She came to support, with her authority and her respect, the newly-elected pope,

[1] "Oblita sexus, nec dispar antiquis Amazonibus, ferrata virorum agmina in bellum agebat fœmina."—WILL. MALMES., *de Gest. reg.*, b. iii. "Nullum fere periculum metuebat. . . . Quisnam potentum unquam, ut illa, deduxit exercitum."—*Vit. S. Anselm.*, c. 18, in *Act. SS. O. B.*, ix. 477-479.

[2] "Perfecto utique odio oderat excommunicatos."—*Ibid.* "Perfecto odio oderam illos."—Psalm cxxxviii. 22.

[3] "Sola resistit ei Mathildis filia Petri,
Rex exardescens contra quam concitat enses."
—DOMNIZO, ii. 1.

"Inventa est sola atque unica dux et marchionissa Mathilda in fide permanens . . . papæ Gregorio obediens, totam se suæ tradidit dispositioni . . . cui in remissionem datur ut, sicut altera Debora, populum judicet, militiam peragat."—*Vit. S. Anselm.*, *Act. SS. O. B.*, ix. 474, 475. "Sola enim tunc temporis inventa est inter fœminas, quæ regis potentiam aspernata sit, quæ calliditatibus ejus et potentiæ etiam bellico certamine obviaverit."—HUG. FLAVINIAC., ap. Pagi, 1199.

[4] "Gregorium papam, cui servit ut altera Martha."—DOMN., *loc. cit.*

[5] "Hæc est mulier illa de qua ab obtrectatoribus fidei et conculcatoribus veritatis crimen incestus Sancto Pontifici objiciebatur. Cui si deessent meritorum laudes, hoc satis eam commendabilem redderet, quod cum tali viro dum exprobratur, dum convicia suscipit, dum improperia audit, approbatur, honoratur, laudatur."—HUG. FLAVIN., *loc. cit.*

as became one who, the moment she was mistress of her person and her states, had made the Roman Church her sole heir.[1]

Thanks to the army of the princess,[2] the partisans of the legitimate pope were able to snatch from the schismatics all Rome right of the Tiber, comprising Castle St. Angelo, St. Peter's, and also the island in the Tiber situated in the midst of the city. It was there that Victor established his residence, and received the homage of almost the whole Roman nobility.[3] But a new revolt broke out, on the eve of the festival of St. Peter, among the numerous population which remained attached to the imperial cause and to the anti-Pope Guibert. It prevented Victor from celebrating the feast of the Holy Apostle, and obliged him to return to Monte Cassino, the crosier of which abbey he had determined to retain as long as he lived. This holy house, after having been the cradle of monasticism, was to serve, for a while, as asylum and true See to the papacy, so gravely endangered by the tumultuous disturbance of the Roman people. Reality is here in harmony with a vision which is said to have appeared to certain pilgrims. These strangers were journeying to Monte Cassino, when they encountered a venerable old man, who was no other than the Apostle Peter, and who told them that he was going to take refuge with his brother Benedict, on account of the troubles of the apostolic city.[4]

Tranquil in the retirement of his monastery, and supported on one side by the Normans, and on the other by Matilda,

[1] By her first donation, made in 1077, and repeated in her second deed in 1102. Her mother and husband had both died in the previous year, and she had no children.

[2] "A comitissa et ejus exercitu."—*Chron. Cass.*, iii. 68. ". . . Auxilio et ope comitissæ. . . ."

[3] "Omnem pæne nobilium cœtum."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Canonicum senem. Percontantibus quis esset: Petrum apostolum se esse respondit. . . . Ad fratrem Benedictum proficiscor, ut cum illo passionis meæ celebrem diem. Romæ quippe consistere nequeo, quia Ecclesia mea diversis procellis agitatur."—*Ibid.*

the new pope thought it wise to send against the external enemies of the Church all the Catholic forces at his disposal. He assembled an Italian army, chiefly of Pisans and Genoese; gave them the banner of St. Peter; and despatched them to Africa, for the purpose of there repressing the excesses of the Saracens, and also, no doubt, in order to effect a favourable diversion on the side of Sicily, where the Normans, under the son of Robert Guiscard, were still proceeding in their career of conquest. The expedition was fortunate: the fleet of the two republics came back loaded with spoil, which was chiefly consecrated by the victor to the embellishment of churches.[1]

Meantime the anti-pope continued to devastate the imperialist provinces subject to his authority, and everywhere replaced Catholic bishops and abbots by simoniacal, disorderly, and ignorant clergy.[2] Warned by the indignation of the faithful, Victor, who had just confirmed the excommunication and deposition of Henry IV.,[3] assembled the bishops of southern Italy at the Council of Beneventum, where he renewed the anathemas pronounced by Gregory against the anti-pope, against those who should receive bishoprics or abbeys from the hands of laymen, and against every emperor, king, duke, or secular person whatever, who should dispose of ecclesiastical dignities.[4]

The sovereign pontiff was also obliged to cut off from the communion of the faithful two men who, until then, had

[1] *Chron. Cass.*, iii. c. 70; BERTHOLD., *Const.*, ad ann. 1088; PAGI, *Crit.*, ad ann. 1087, c. 3.

[2] "Scelestos et illiteratos, singulis urbibus, monasteriis ecclesiisque præfecit . . . dum non esset qui armato resisteret. . . . Catholici vero qui zelo Dei fidem ac religionem tuebantur, Victori papæ adhærebant."—*Chron. Cass.*, iii. 69.

[3] "Litteræ domini Papæ in quibus . . . judicium sui antecessoris piæ memoriæ Gregorii papæ super Henricum et fautores ejus apertissime confirmavit."—BERTHOLD., *Const.*, ad ann. 1087.

[4] "Non timens æterni imperatoris judicium. . . . Si quis item imperatorum, regum, ducum. . . . Ecclesiasticam dignitatem dare præsumpserit. . . ."—*Ibid.*, c. 71. This council was held in August 1078.

nobly combated for the good cause: Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons, and Richard, Abbot of Marseilles, who contested the validity of his election. Victor had resisted the unanimous suffrages of the electors so long, that he had a good right, in the interests of the peace and unity of the Church, to proceed against those who disputed the authority he had so unwillingly assumed. Hugh, hitherto so zealous for the cause of the Church, that Gregory, when dying, had, as we have seen, named him among those whom he pointed out as his successors, was now, perhaps, misled by a movement of envy and ambition; and, in a letter to the Countess Matilda, he calumniated both the antecedents and the intentions of Victor, imputing to him a culpable complaisance towards the emperor.[1] The archbishop nobly expiated this fault by his after-conduct; and if it is true that ambition had inspired it, he was promptly punished—for Victor dying a little while afterwards,[2] Hugh, being suspended, was naturally excluded from the choice of the cardinals, and thus left without a rival Odo of Ostia, the only eligible candidate among the four whom Gregory had recommended. Victor, feeling the approach of death, convoked the bishops and cardinals at Monte Cassino, and presented Odo to them as his successor.[3] It was only, however, after another interregnum of six months, in March 1088, that Odo, thanks to the exertions of the Countess Matilda, was elected in an assembly held at Terracina. The Cardinal-bishop of Porto brought the ad-

[1] Hugh founded his accusation on the promise made by Didier, while still Abbot of Monte Cassino, to Henry IV., that he would intercede with the pope to obtain his coronation as emperor—a promise which was in no way to be blamed, since he knew that Gregory would never consent to crown an emperor who should not have satisfied the Church, as Noël Alexandre and Pagi have well remarked. The letters of Hugh to Matilda are found in the chronicle of Hugo de Flavigny, ap. LABBE, *Bibl. MS.*, vol. i., and in COLETTI, *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 705.

[2] September 16, 1087.

[3] "Juxta Gregorii Papæ statutum. . . . Accipite eum et in Romana sede locate, meamque vicem in omnibus, quousque id facere possitis, habetote." —*Chron. Cass.*, iii. c. 73.

hesion of the Roman clergy, and the Prefect of Rome, Benedict, that of all the faithful laity. The bishops, cardinals, and abbots,[1] to the number of forty, after having prepared themselves by a three days' fast, declared that their unanimous choice fell upon Odo. His woollen frock was then taken from him, he was clothed in purple, and proclaimed pope under the name of Urban II. Thus it was again a monk who, after Gregory VII. and Victor III., was commissioned to preside over the Church in most critical circumstances. Urban was a Frenchman, son of a noble of Champaigne.[2] After having received the instructions of St. Bruno at Rheims, he became a monk at Cluny under the Abbot St. Hugh, who sent him as his representative to the Court of Gregory VII., at the latter's accession. Successively named Cardinal and Bishop of Ostia, and then legate in Germany, Urban was made prisoner by Henry IV.; and in this hard school was formed a character strong enough to continue the contest begun by Hildebrand, and to preach the first Crusade—the greatest enterprise of Christendom. The day following his election, the new pope announced, by an encyclical letter to the Catholic world, the heavy charge which had been imposed upon him,[3] and declared to the bishops and faithful the spirit which animated him. "Those who nominated me," he says, "declare that they resolved to do so by the authority and command of my predecessors, Gregory and Victor, of pious memory. God knows how great a constraint they have been obliged to put upon my desires and my will. But since, without ambition or presumption on my part, I have been forced to accept such a burden, it remains only for me to conjure you to continue

[1] In the first rank of the latter we find Oderisio, successor to Victor as Abbot of Monte Cassino: "ex nobili Marsorum comitum stirpe," says the chronicle. He governed until 1105.

[2] His father was Seigneur of Lagery, between Chatillon-sur-Marne and Rheims.

[3] "Statim in sequenti die, missis litteris omnibus catholicis."—*Chron. Cass.*, iv. 2. This letter, the loss of which Baronius deplored, has been found by D. Martène, and published by him in *Ampliss. collect.*, vol. i. p. 520.

faithful to the Church, to defend her, and to fight like valiant warriors in the day of the Lord's battles. As for me, have confidence, and believe that, eager to follow point by point the steps of our blessed father Pope Gregory VII., I will repulse all he repulsed, condemn all he condemned, embrace all that he loved, and confirm all that he thought good and Catholic." [1]

After this, Urban, skilfully drawing upon the resources furnished to him by his monastic relations, appealed to his former superior, Abbot Hugh of Cluny. "I implore you," he wrote, "if you have any pity in your heart, if you cherish any recollection of your son and pupil, come and satisfy my ardent desires by your presence; or if this may not be, send me at least such of your children, my old comrades, as I may consider and receive like yourself, who will fill your place near me—who will in my troubles make me seem to hear your consoling words, taste the sweetness of your love, and know what concerns you and the congregation of our brothers. Above all, I beg of you, cause them to pray and entreat the Lord that He will deign to restore His Church, now so cruelly exposed; and know that this is a special obligation which I impose on you." [2]

[1] "De me porro ita confidete et credite, sicut de beatissimo patre nostro Papa Gregorio, cujus ex toto sequi vestigia cupiens, omnia quæ respuit respuo, quæ damnavit damno, quæ dilexit prorsus amplector, quæ vero rata et catholica duxerit confirmo et approbo, et ad postremum in utramque partem qualiter ipse sensit, in omnibus omnino sentio atque consentio. . . ." —Datum Terracinæ, iii., *Id. Mart.*

[2] "Si qua tibi sunt pietatis viscera, si qua filii et alumni memoria . . . tales de filiis tuis confratribus meis, in quibus te videam, te suscipiam, tuæ consolationis in immensis perturbationibus positus verba cognoscerem, qui tuam caritatem, tuæque dilectionis affectum mihi repræsentens," &c. —MAB., *Ann. Ben.*, v. 1, 67, No. 55. This letter, in the copy of it given by Mabillon, is dated May 13th; but, as he has himself remarked, the first part shows clearly that it was written the same day as the preceding, March 13th. . . . Some months later, by a diploma of November 1st, he confirms all the immunities and possessions of the monastery, where he had been regenerated by a second grace of the Holy Spirit, and received from Hugh the first lessons of monastic life.—*Bibl. Cluniac.*, p. 514.

His acts corresponded with this effusion of his soul. He tried to surround himself with monastic assistants. He raised his namesake Odo, also a monk of Cluny, to the dignity of Cardinal-bishop of Ostia, which he himself had borne before his election. He took two deacons from among the monks of Monte Cassino to be his secretaries; one Leo,[1] distinguished by learning and eloquence—the other, John, whom he shortly afterwards named Cardinal and Chancellor of the Church, and who was one day to succeed him under the name of Gelasius II. The pope then went to Monte Cassino, the palace and citadel of the sovereign pontiff: he there received a visit from Roger and Bohemond, sons of Robert Guiscard, and hastened to consecrate their expiatory gifts to the Abbey of Bantino, in Apulia, by going himself to dedicate the church, and by giving complete immunity to this monastery, which had been despoiled by the first Normans, and, moreover, impoverished by the sacrilegious usurpation of simoniacal bishops.[2]

The sons of Robert Guiscard were at this time in arms against each other to dispute their father's succession; and as they agreed to acknowledge the authority of Urban II., he was able to become the mediator of their quarrels, and to bring about a reconciliation and an equitable division.[3]

[1] We must not, as Baronius has done, confound this Leo with the Leo who was author of the first books of the Chronicle of Monte Cassino. They were both monks of that abbey, and both Cardinals and Bishops of Ostia.—PAGI, *Crit.*, ad 1088, c. 3; PETR. DIAC., *De. vir. ill.*, cc. 30 and 31.

[2] "Quia monasterium ipsum . . . cum sacrilegis usurpationibus episcoporum innumera lugenda detrimenta et indigne sustinuit."—Deed of the pope, quoted by Baronius, ad ann. 1088, c. 8; UGHELLI, *Italia sacra*, vol. vii.; D. RUINART, *Hist. d'Urbain II.*, c. 28. Bantino is in the diocese of Acerenza. We find also in Baronius, ad. ann. 1090, cc. 20–28, an important diploma given by the two princes, with the consent of their barons, in favour of the liberties of Bantino.

[3] The treaty between the two brothers was concluded in 1089, by their uncle Count Roger, and Cardinal Henry, Urban's legate. Roger had the duchy of Pouille and Calabria; Bohemond, afterwards so celebrated in the first Crusade, had Bari, Otranto, Tarento, &c.—PIRRO, *Silicia Sacra*, vol. iii., *not. Episc. Miazzar;* ST. MARC, *Hist. of Italy*, iv. 844.

In spite of their intestine dissensions, these valiant princes, in Italy as well as in Normandy, never failed in their devotion to the orthodox popes, and their energetic assistance was never wanting to Urban II.[1]

King Philip of France, on his side, hastened to acknowledge the new pope;[2] and Christian Spain soon rendered double homage to his authority and his solicitude. The day that Gregory VII. breathed his last at Salerno, Toledo, the ancient metropolis of Spain, was taken by assault from the Arabs by Alfonso VI., King of Castile and Leon;[3] and the victor immediately convoked an assembly of lords and prelates, where a French monk of Cluny, named Bernard, was unanimously chosen archbishop of the illustrious see thus reconquered.[4] Alfonso, who showed the tenderest devotion to the ancient abbey, contributed more than any one to the construction of the immense abbatial church. It was said that he had wished to become a monk there,[5] and had obtained Bernard from Abbot Hugh, in order to place him at the head of the famous Abbey of St. Just and St. Facond. The new archbishop desired to go to Italy to receive the pall from the hands of a pope who, like himself, was sprung from the ranks of Cluny. Urban did more than was asked of him; he re-established the ancient primacy of Spain in favour of the metropolitan see of Toledo, thus gloriously restored, after 370 years of interruption, by the heroic efforts of Christian knighthood.[6]

[1] "Normanni Catholico papæ concorditer favebant; verum inter se truculenter dissidebant."—ORD. VIT., vii. 677.

[2] BERTH., *Const.*, ad ann. 1089.

[3] May 25, 1085.

[4] "Convocavit regni proceres, et majores episcopos et abbates et viros religiosos . . . et communiter et concorditer elegerunt. . . ."—RODER. TOLET., b. vi. c. 24.

[5] BARRON., ann. 1093, c. 10. A chronicle quoted by Baronius calls him "in conversatione Cluniacensis abbatis obedientiarius."

[6] "Labore populi Christiani."—Diploma given at Anagni, Oct. 15, 1088. In Archbishop Roderick of Toledo, book iv. c. 26, may be seen the curious account of the anger of King Alfonso with the Primate Bernard,

Bernard, and the other monks of Cluny established in Spain, where their ascendency was very considerable, contributed with all their might to the substitution of the Gallo-Roman liturgy for the Mozarabic ritual.[1] Another French monk, Adelme,[2] Abbot of Chaise-Dieu, had been present with the King of Castile's army at the passage of the Tagus. Mounted on his ass, he rode into the swollen river singing the verse of the Psalm, "*Hi in curribus et hi in equis: nos autem in nomine Domini.*" The example of the good monk shamed the hesitating soldiers; they swam after him, and the stream was crossed by the whole Christian army.[3] Adelme went barefoot to Rome, whence he returned to shut himself up in the Abbey of Chaise-Dieu.[4] The report of his virtues and his miracles crossed the Pyrenees. Queen Constance, wife of Alfonso VI., implored her husband to bring the holy monk to Spain, hoping that his example might sanctify their subjects. They gave him, at the gates of Burgos, a chapel and hospital, which became a famous abbey under the name of San Juan de la Vega, where he ended his life in works of charity and penitence,[5] but not until he had first propagated the

because the latter had made a church of the great mosque which the king had sworn to leave to the Moors. Alfonso wished to have him burned alive, in expiation of the perjury; but the Moors themselves, fearing the indignation of the Christians, obtained his pardon. Bernard succeeded, as legate in Spain, another monk, Richard, Abbot of Marseilles, of whom we have spoken in a previous book.

[1] "Monachi Cluniacenses, qui magna in Hispania auctoritate pollebant, quique natione Galli erant, usus Gallicos, quantum poterant, introducebant."—PAGI, ad ann. 1091, c. 11.

[2] Adelme was born at Loudun, in Poitou, of a great house there.

[3] RADULFUS, auct. *Vit. S. Adelmi*, in *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix. p. 870.

[4] "Balteum militare . . . præcinxit, in cujus status exercitamentis nonnullos sago miles, corde monachus, transegit annos. . . . Ne ab amicis detineretur, intempeste nocte, cum armigero quodam suo . . . clam discessit. Aliquantulum progressus, permutatis cum comite vestibus preciosis, nudis pedibus iter arripiens," &c.—*Ibid.*

[5] "Gloriosis facinoribus aulam et urbes illustrabat."—*Ibid.*, p. 869. The Spaniards venerated him under the name of St. Elesmes. He died in 1097.

strict observance of the Benedictine rule then followed at Chaise-Dieu. The French seem to have been called upon at this time to take a glorious and considerable part in the Catholic restoration of Spain: on one hand holy monks, and on the other numerous knights, had hastened from all the provinces of France at Alfonso's call,[1] when the invasion of the Almiravides gave fresh power to the Saracen sovereignty in the Peninsula. The most distinguished among these Frenchmen was the Norman William.[2] The presence or influence of men of this race, in Spain as in Italy, almost always indicates the preponderance of a deep feeling of devotion to the Roman Church; and, in fact, such had been the consequence of the alliance of the Normans and Catalans by the marriage of Raymond Berenger III., Count of Barcelona, with Matilda, daughter of Robert Guiscard.[3]

In 1090, Raymond wished to present his whole county to the Roman Church, declaring himself the tributary and vassal of St. Peter's successor, as much for love of God and His apostles as for the purpose of securing his independence with regard to other princes.[4] He added a special gift of the town of Tarragona, where Pope Urban hastened to re-establish the ancient metropolis, suppressed for more than

[1] "Hoc accepto nuncio Gallorum proceres certatim milites congregant: denique tam urbana quam rustica plebs se offert. Milites vero gregatim convenientes," &c. The noise of their coming alone put the Saracens to flight.—*Fragm. Histor.*, ap. DUCHESNE, *Script.*, vol. iv. p. 88.

[2] "Inter quos unus Guillelmus . . . quem vidimus, et erat Normannus." —*Chron. Malleac.*, ad ann. 1087.

[3] GUILL., *Apul.*, b. iv. p. 270, ed. Muratori.

[4] "Ego Berengarius . . . amore Dei ductus, donavi Deo et apostolorum principi B. Petro, ejusque vicario Romanæ sedis apostolico, omnem meum honorem . . . ut ego et mei posteri omnes . . . teneamus hoc totum per manum et vocem B. Petri . . . ejusque Vicarii, persolventes ei censum . . . ut omnis hic honor sicut superius continetur, nullatenus transferri possit in alterius potestatis dominium, sed ego tantummodo et posteri mei in perpetuum teneamus hoc totum per manus principis apostolorum . . . et successorum ejus B. Petri sedem canonice regentium."—COLETTI, *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 718.

four centuries in consequence of the Moorish conquest. "The Lord is just," said the pope, in the diploma relating to this reconstitution, "and holy in all His works; and though His judgments are often incomprehensible, it is He who guides the revolutions of kingdoms and of ages. It has seemed good to Him, then, to restore lately the glory of Tarragona, while punishing the sins of its inhabitants. For 390 years the Saracens had made of this city almost a solitude; and behold, the Lord has put into the heart of Christian princes the thought of restoring it. Count Berenger, for the salvation of his soul, and with the consent of his nobles, has given it with all its territory to the blessed Peter. We take it, therefore, under the special protection of the Holy See, and we confirm the liberties and immunities conferred by the Count."[1]

But the joy of seeing the almost simultaneous restoration of two celebrated metropolitans did not cause the sovereign pontiff to lose sight of the protection he owed to other sees in Spain. King Alfonso having ventured to depose and imprison the Bishop of Compostello, the pope issued a reprimand which breathes the very spirit of Gregory VII.: "The world is ruled by two powers—the priestly and the royal. But the one is above the other, inasmuch as kings themselves must give account to the King of the universe. The pastoral office obliges us to provide, according to our power, for the salvation not only of the small, but of the great, that we may restore unhurt, to the true Shepherd, the sheep which He has confided to us. We are bound, above all, to watch over thy safety, O king, whom Christ has chosen to be the champion of the faith and of His Church. We pray thee therefore, glorious prince, in the

[1] "Justus Dominus in viis suis. . . . Ipse transfert regna et mutat tempora. . . . Ipsi visum est, &c. B. comes pro animæ suæ salute, cum suæ potestatis magnatibus non solum restitutioni præfatæ urbis institit, sed et urbem ipsam et omnem potestatis suæ terram B. Petro ejusque vicariis legali stipulatione tradidit," &c. Given at Capua, July 1, 1091.—COLETTI, *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 718.

name of God and His apostles, to cause this bishop to be restored to his dignity by the Archbishop of Toledo, and to send him to us with thy ambassadors, that we may judge him. Otherwise thou wilt oblige us to that against thee which we should do unwillingly."[1]

While Urban II. thus corrected the excesses of orthodox kings, and saw the victorious Catholics of Spain declare themselves his vassals, he was himself almost a prisoner in the island of the Tiber, forced to defend himself against the snares of the schismatics who occupied half Rome—and so poor, that he lived upon the alms of the Roman ladies, and even of women of the lower classes."[2]

The time, meanwhile, had arrived when he must occupy himself with the most pressing danger which menaced the Church—the increase of power in the hands of the emperor,[3] the fomenter and protector of the schism of which the anti-Pope Guibert was pontiff. Though the imperialists of Germany and Italy were Guibert's only adherents,[4] their support was formidable, on account of the number of German and Italian bishops who belonged to the party. If, profiting by the hesitation of Didier, and the lamentable uncertainty of the two interregnums which intervened between the death of Gregory and the accession of Urban, Henry had been able to return to Italy at the head of a victorious army, he would no doubt have procured the triumph of the anti-pope, and assured for a long time the servitude of the

[1] "Duo sunt, rex Ildefonse, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur. . . . Sed sacerdotalis dignitas tanto potestatem regiam antecedit, ut, &c. . . . Sin autem facere nos erga dilectionem tuam compelleres invitos, quod nos quoque fecisse nollemus."—COLETTI, *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 752.

[2] ST. MARC, *Hist. d'Italie*, vol. iv. p. 843.

[3] Like Cardinal Baronius and other Catholic writers, we give to Henry IV. the title of emperor from the time of his coronation at Rome, in 1084, although this ceremony was performed by the anti-pope.

[4] "Solus Henricus et pedissequi ejusdem Guilberto cohærebant. Galli vero et Angli aliæque gentes pene omnes per orbem Urbano pie obsecundabant."—ORDER. VIT., b. viii. p. 677. This assertion is not correct as regards England, as will be seen later.

Church.[1] But the hand of God detained the prince in Germany long enough to allow an energetic pope to reunite and direct against him all the Catholic powers. The Saxon people, who had so generously joined their cause to that of the Roman Church during the lifetime of Gregory, was still, after his death, the principal bulwark of apostolic liberty. This noble nation, though distant from Italy, thus shared with the Normans the mission of repulsing or warding off the blows destined for the Church.

Henry IV. had reawakened all their exasperation against him, by placing intruders in the sees of orthodox bishops, and retaining the confiscated property he had promised to restore. The Bavarians, his oldest adherents, declared against him, headed by their Duke Welf, an offshoot of the famous Guelphic race. The Suabians, who obeyed as their duke the son of King Rodolph—killed fighting for the Church and the ancient laws of the Empire—joined the Saxons. Henry, at the head of 20,000 men, chiefly raised in the Rhine cities, marched against the confederates. The latter, only 10,000 in number, advanced under the command of Ecbert, Margrave of Misnia, and of Hermann of Luxemburg, the prince whom the German Catholics had elected king: they drew with them a car surmounted by an immense cross and a consecrated banner, as the insignia of a Catholic army.[2] The forces met on the field of Bleichsseld, near Würzburg, August 11, 1086. Before the battle, all the Catholic army knelt while the Archbishop Hartwig, of Magdeburg, invoked the aid of God, in whose name they were about to draw their swords.[3] Unlike most mediæval battles, this was a combat of infantry: Duke Welf, with his

[1] LÜDEN, b. ix. pp. 238, 239.

[2] In this may be recognised the model of the *carroccio*, so much used in the Lombard cities during their wars with the emperors.

[3] "Jamjam congressuri, omnes in terram prostrati, cœlum oratione penetravere, quam . . . archiepiscopus cum multis lacrymis et gemitibus effudit. Igitur in nomine Domini congressi."—BERTHOLD., *Const.*, ad 1086. This writer was an eyewitness of the battle.

Bavarians and many Saxons, chose to fight on foot,[1] like the imperialist burghers. Those troops did no great service to their master; the men of Cologne and Utrecht fled at the very outset. Henry defended himself bravely, but nevertheless sustained the most complete defeat of his whole reign. The Catholics immediately occupied the town of Würzburg, capital of the duchy of Franconia, and of the hereditary domains of the imperial house: there they re-established the legitimate bishop, Adalberon, who had been ten years in exile. The Bishops of Salzburg and Passau were also shortly after restored. But as the emperor united most indefatigable activity to great personal courage, he soon repaired the consequences of his defeat, and retook Würzburg. Before bringing back the intruded bishop, Meginhard, Henry tried to win Adalberon over to his party; but the latter would not even see him. He said to the princes sent on this mission by the emperor, "You may kill me, but you cannot force me voluntarily to see or speak with your king."[2] Accordingly, he again quitted his bishopric, and leaving his episcopal city, sought refuge in the Abbey of Lambach, which he had founded on his patrimonial estates, and where he died after four years of exile.[3]

The following year various conferences between the emperor and the Catholic lords, who called themselves the faithful of St. Peter,[4] brought about no result. The princes communicated to Henry letters from the new pope, Victor III., which confirmed Gregory's sentence;[5] they promised to obtain his recognition everywhere as emperor if he would

[1] "Welfo dux cum sua legione, et Magdeburgensis legio, relictis equis, pedites incedebant."—BERTHOLD., *Const.*, ad 1086; cf. STENTZEL, i. 528.

[2] "Dicens se quidem posse mori, non autem flecti ut vellet unquam sponte sua regem Henricum videre vel alloqui."—WALTRAM., *De unit. Eccles. adversus Hildebrand.*, vol. ii. p. 303, ed. Freher.

[3] He was son of the Count of Lambach; the abbey still exists on the Traun, in Upper Austria. He died Oct. 6, 1090.—STENTZEL, ii. 294.

[4] "Fideles S. Petri."—At Oppenheim in March, and at Worms in August 1087.

[5] BERNOLD, ad ann. 1087. Quoted before.

only be reconciled with the Church;[1] but Henry declared that he did not regard himself as excommunicated. The princes then refused to treat with a public sinner who hardened himself in misdoing. They were, perhaps, encouraged in this course by a message from King Ladislas, of Hungary, who sent them word that, in case of need, he would come with 20,000 knights to the help of the faithful of St. Peter against the schismatics.[2] But though strong enough to make head, often with success, against Henry, and to hinder him from acting vigorously against the Church in Italy, the confederates wanted a military chief possessing sufficient ascendency to maintain himself in opposition to the emperor. Hermann de Salm, Count of Luxemburg, the king whom they had some time previously elected, had shown himself completely unfitted for his mission, and, loaded with mortifications inflicted by his allies, had retired to Lorraine, where he died in 1088. The most influential chief of the Catholics, both before and after this death, was Ecbert, Margrave of Misnia, an equivocal personage, selfish, but brave and skilful, who often deceived both parties, and was entirely without that loyalty and religious devotion indispensable to the Church's defenders. In an insurrection at Goslar, fomented by this Margrave, but the cause of which is difficult to discover, the Church lost one of its bravest and purest pontiffs, Burkhardt, Bishop of Halberstadt. On the eve of the outbreak, having just arrived in the city, drawn thither by a projected conference with the imperialists, who were ravaging the lands of his diocese, he had declared to his intimates that he felt himself too old and weary to continue the war, but that as long as he lived he would avoid, like a pestilence, all communion with tyranny, and that his only ambition was to find a refuge in some country, no matter what, where he might be

[1] "Eique adjutorium suum ad obtinendum regnum si de excommunicatione exire vellet, fideliter promiserunt."—BERNOLD, ad ann. 1087.

[2] BERNHOLD., ad ann. 1087.

for ever delivered from the sight of the tyrant.[1] Assailed in the dead of night by assassins, he was struck down with stones and clubs, and finally pierced by a lance, the iron of which remained in his body. They carried him, dying, to the neighbouring abbey of Ilsemburg, which he had reformed, and where he had chosen his burial-place; for the monasteries in Germany were even more than elsewhere the last asylum of orthodox bishops. He died there, singing a hymn to the Prince of the Apostles, to whom the last offering of his life was thus presented.[2] Some months later death carried off Gebhard, the holy Archbishop of Salzburg,[3] who had been restored shortly before to his metropolis by the swords of Count Engelbert and his knights. The monks of the abbey of Admont, founded by this bishop, received his body, and graved on his tomb the following epitaph: "He suffered for love of justice; he endured exile through the hatred of the king; he preferred misery to schism. . . . O Rome, he obeyed thy decisions. . . . Faithful to the law of God, he feared neither king, nor violence, nor shame."[4] Henry wished to replace him immediately by one of his own creatures; but the Catholics of the province chose an orthodox prelate in the person of Thiemon,[5] Abbot of St. Peter, a Bavarian noble, who had been a monk at Hirschau,

[1] "Tyrannicæ communionis consortium tanquam letiferam pestem quoad vixerit fugiendam decrevisse. Ea propter id sibi potissimum cordi esse, quatenus . . . quodcumque sors obtulerit, exilium expetat, ubi non solum a communione, verum etiam ab aspectu tyranni perpetuo exsors maneat." —*Ann. Saxon.*, ad ann. 1088.

[2] "Hymnum: *Jam bone Pastor Petre*, altisona voce exorsus."—*Ann. Sax.*, April 6, 1088.

[3] Died June 15, 1088.

[4] "Propter justitiam toleravit et ipse rapinam;
Regis ob hanc odium fugit in exilium,
Malens ille miser quam schismatis esse minister . . .
Servans, Roma, tuo debita judicio. . . .
Hic pro lege Dei nescivit cedere Regi,
Vel cuiquam forti, vel quoque dedecori."
—ACTA S. GEBH., ap. CANIS., *Lect. antiq.*, vi. p. 1237.

[5] Elected, March 25, 1090.

which, as we have said, the holy Abbot William had succeeded in making a centre of Catholic resistance in Germany.

Meanwhile Henry, fortified by the death of the Bishop of Halberstadt, by the submission of the Archbishop of Magdeburg, and the equivocal conduct of the Margrave Ecbert, was able again to attempt the subjugation of Saxony, and had nearly accomplished it when Ecbert surprised and defeated him near Gleichen in Thuringia.[1] Burkhardt of Lausanne, a bishop who, by a scandal unique even amidst the disorders of his party, was married,[2] and thus worthy to bear the banner of a schismatic emperor, was killed in the battle; and another of Henry's most active adherents, Archbishop Liemar of Bremen, was taken by the young Count Lothaire,[3] son of a knight killed at Nohenburg[4] for the good cause, who thus, at the age of fourteen, began a life which he was to end in the imperial purple after having given peace and freedom to the Church.

Soon after this victory, Ecbert perished, assassinated by the soldiers of the Abbess of Quedlinburg, sister of the emperor. The position of the Catholics was lamentable on account of the defection or intrusion of most of the bishops. Only five could be counted in the ranks of the orthodox;[5] two of these, Adalberon of Würzburg and Hermann of Metz, died in 1090; but there remained Altmann of Passau and Gebhard of Constance, upon whom Urban principally depended, when, at this epoch, he resolved to interfere directly in the affairs of Germany. Gebhard was descended from

[1] At Christmas, 1088.

[2] According to Stentzel this was to fulfil the words of the Apostle (unius uxoris virum, 1 Tim. iii. 2). It is unfortunate for Burkhardt and his modern panegyrist, that he was the only bishop of his time, Catholic or schismatic, who interpreted the Apostle's text in this manner.

[3] Of Supplingenburg.

[4] Victory gained by Henry over the Saxons, 1075.

[5] Hermann of Metz, Adalberon of Würzburg, Albert of Worms, Altmann of Passau, and Gebhard of Constance.—BERNOLD, ad ann. 1089. The three first were imprisoned or driven from their dioceses.—Cf. B. I. p. 165, No. 2.

the house of Lähringen, equally powerful and devoted to the Church; he was a monk of Hirschau, and pupil of the Abbot St. William. Urban had known him during his legation, and had himself consecrated him Bishop of Constance. By his letters of April 18, 1089,[1] he constituted him his legate, and while renewing the excommunication in the first degree against Henry and the anti-pope, and in the second degree against their supporters and soldiers, he gave to Gebhard the powers necessary for modifying, with regard to the faithful, the consequences of their relations with the excommunicated, relations which became difficult to avoid during so prolonged a war. The Catholic princes in vain renewed their offers of peace and complete submission to the emperor, on the sole condition that he should renounce the anti-Pope Guibert, and reconcile himself with the Church. Henry himself seems to have been inclined to do this, but the bishops ordained in the schism dissuaded him from it, in the well-founded fear that they might find themselves sacrificed together with the anti-pope in the future treaty.[2] It was necessary, therefore, to continue the war. These supporters of the revolt against the Church did not fight with arms only; besides warlike bishops, such as Burkhardt, the married Bishop of Lausanne, who died for his emperor on the field of battle, there were pleaders and preachers who spoke in the name of Holy Scripture, and took advantage of the calamities which fell upon the Catholics, to gain souls to the imperialist schism.[3] It was with this object that Waltram, intruding Archbishop of Magdeburg, wrote to Count Louis of Thuringia a letter in which

[1] Cf. COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 737.

[2] "Duces et comites fideles S. Petri cum Henrico colloquium habuerunt . . . quam quidem conditionem nec ipse multum respuit, si tamen in hoc ei principes sui assentiri vellent, videlicet episcopi, qui se cum Guiberto deponendos esse non dubitaverunt . . . hi ergo penitus hac vice dissuaserunt ne S. Ecclesiæ reconciliaretur."—BERN., *loc. cit.*; cf. WALTRAM, *Apolog. Henr. IV.*, ap. FREHER, *Script.* i. 296.

[3] "Ex nostro triumpho vos domino nostro Imperatori lucrifaciamus."—Epist. WALTRAM, ap. DODECHIN., in PIPTOR, *Script.*, vol. i.

he expatiates on the advantages of concord and charity, and invokes those texts on which so many have tried to justify the complicity of the Church with tyranny and wickedness. "The Apostle says, 'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.'[1] And yet our friends would persuade women and ignorant people that they ought not to obey the royal authority. Will they resist God? Are they stronger than He? But what says the prophet: '*All they that were incensed against Thee, Lord, shall be confounded, and they that strive with Thee shall perish.*'[2] Rodolph, Hildebrand, Ecbert, and many other lords have resisted the ordinance of God in the person of the Emperor Henry, and have perished: what has ended so ill must have had an ill beginning." The Count of Thuringia borrowed the pen of Stephen, Bishop of Halberstadt, the worthy successor of the martyr Burkhardt, and addressed to the intruder a letter, of which these are some passages.[3] "We say that your understanding of the Apostle's precept is wrong, and your interpretation worse. For if all power comes from God in the sense which you understand, how does it happen that the Lord says by His prophet, '*They have reigned, and not by Me; they have made princes, and I knew them not*'?[4]

"Augustine, explaining the Apostle's sentence, says, 'If a power commands that which is against God, then contemn the power and have no fear of it.'[5] But let us listen to the Apostle, who himself speaks thus, '*There is no power but*

[1] Rom. xiii. 1. [2] Isaiah xli. 11.

[3] We borrow Fleury's translation, B. 63, c. 52. Cardinal Baronius adds: "Huc usque litteræ Waltrami quem nostri sæculi politici statuant sibi sui ipsorum dogmatis auctorem et defensorem."

[4] "Ipsi regnaverunt et non ex me: principes extiterunt et non cognovi eos."—OSÉE, viii. 4.

[5] "Quod si potestas aliquia jubeat quod contra Deum sit, hic contemne potestatem, non timendo potestatem alioquin."

what comes from God;' and afterwards says, '*And those which come from God are ordained.*'[1] Why have you suppressed this truth? Why have you wished to veil from us the marrow and the bone of this sentence? Foreseeing by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit that there would arise one day in the Church heretics, such as you and your fellows, who would call evil good and good evil, who would change light into darkness, and transform the precepts of truth into arguments for error, the Apostle chose to cut short the conjectures of the reprobate mind by this addition, '*Those which come from God are ordained;*' now show us an ordained power and we will no longer resist, but hold out our arms to it. But how, if a single drop of blood remains in your veins, do you not blush to call Henry IV. king, and to say that he is ordained?[2] Is he ordained to authorise crime, to confound all human and divine law? Is he ordained to sin against his own body, and to abuse his wife in a manner before unheard of? Is he ordained to treat as prostitutes the widows that come to him to demand justice?"

Here follows a vivid enumeration of Henry's crimes and attacks upon the Church, upon the bishoprics, upon the abbeys sold by him or given up for often infamous reasons.[3] Then the pontiff goes on: "Excommunicated for his crimes by the Apostolic See, he will never have rule or power over us who are Catholics. You reproach us with hating our brothers, but God grant that we may never count Henry among our brothers or among Christians, who, deaf to the

[1] This is the translation given by Fleury, *loc. cit.*, moving the comma of the verse thus: "Quæ autem sunt a Deo, ordinatæ sunt."

[2] "Miror si in te vel gutta sanguinis est quod non erubescis. . . . An ordo tibi videtur jus dare sceleri . . . uxorem propriam scelere omnibus sæculis mundi inaudito lupanar facere?"

[3] "Etenim Constantiensem, Babenberg, Mogunt, et plures alias pro pecunia, Ratisbon. August. Strasburg. pro gladio, abbatiam Fuldens. pro adulterio, Monasteriens. episcopatum (quod dicere et audire nefas est) pro sodomitica immunditia vendidit, quæ si impudenter negare volueris, teste cœlo, teste terra, omnes etiam a furno redeuntes scioli concludent."

repeated call of the Church, should rather be considered a heathen and a publican! We hate him, and we offer our hatred to God as a great sacrifice, saying with the Psalmist, '*Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee? am not I grieved with Thine enemies?*'[1] For this reason we strive to regard the enemies of the Church as our own enemies, and we hate them because they are the enemies of God, not ours. . . . You preach to us peace with all men; but you forget to add, with the apostle, '*if it may be.*' Now it cannot be with the enemies of God. What said the divine Saviour, who is Himself our peace? '*I come not to bring peace upon earth, but a sword.*'[2] What is this? Why does peace bring a sword? Why does it declare war? To annihilate the peace of Satan, for he also has his peace, of which the Lord spoke when He said, '*While the strong man keeps his house, his possessions are in peace.*'[3] Oh, with what skill does the devil defend his house in these days by the aid of you, his satellites, who, armed with perfidy, are impenetrable to the shafts of truth and faith! But our Lord may also come and vanquish the strong man, and snatch from him the arms in which he trusts. We are not wrong, then, in detesting that false peace, more cruel than all wars, which the Psalmist thus brands, '*I detested the foolish when I saw the prosperity of the wicked.*'[4] You tell us also that Pope Gregory, King Rodolph, and the Marquis Ecbert are dead miserably, and you felicitate your master on having survived them! But is it not better to die well than to live ill? Why not also felicitate Nero on having survived the apostles Peter and Paul? of Herod on having survived St. John? or Pilate our Lord Jesus Christ? . . . For us who have graven the Word of God on our hearts as on diamonds, we contemn all the phantoms which rise up against the truth of God;

[1] "Cujus odium pro magno sacrificio Deo offerimus, dicentes cum Psalmista: Nonne qui oderunt te, Domine, oderam, et super inimicos tuos tabescebam? Perfecto odio oderam illos et inimici facti sunt."—Psalm cxxxix. [2] Matt. x. [3] Luke xi.

[4] "Super iniquos zelavi, pacem peccatorum videns."—Psalm lxxii.

we glorify ourselves in tribulation; we may be calumniated, proscribed, exiled, killed, but beat or vanquished never! Our greatest joy is in the glory of our fathers, who, in resisting the commands of princes, have gained a blessed eternity."[1]

Thus spoke a Catholic prince by the mouth of an orthodox bishop, and such writings balance many battles. Scattered throughout Germany, they roused the zeal of the pontifical party, which, in spite of its recent losses, still counted numerous adherents, especially among the higher nobility of southern Germany. If the Saxons, exhausted by so many combats, resigned themselves, with the exception of Werner, the exiled Bishop of Merseburg, to the emperor's yoke, the Bavarians, on the other hand, under Duke Welf, continued to offer to him an energetic resistance. The legate, Altmann of Passau (who died soon after),[2] left the Catholics of the banks of the Danube under the guidance of a vigorous chief, the monk Thiemon, now Archbishop of Salzburg, who was able, like his sainted predecessor, to endure exile, captivity, and all the violence of persecution. Condemned to die in prison, he felt the headsman's axe fall twice upon his neck.[3]

The contest was, above all, warm in Suabia, under the direction of Gebhard, the legate of Constance, where William of Hirschau was still living.[4] The holy abbot, not content

[1] "Quæ nos verba in memoria adamantina scribentes . . . omnem similitudinem extollentem se adversus veritatem Dei contemnimus; et gloriantes in tribulationibus, calumniari, proscribi et exterminari, denique occidi possumus: flecti vel vinci non possumus. Et cum magno tripudio illud . . . de patribus nostris exultamus, qui, contemnentes jussa principum, meruerunt præmia æterna."—DODECHIN., *loc. cit.*

[2] He died August 10, 1081.

[3] "Surgensque dicto symbolo cum oratione procubuit, et cervicem super lignum extendit. Accedens lictor, totis viribus ensem adegit, sacram vero cervicem . . . secare non potuit. Tantum summa cutis vix tenuem velut lineam ictus, et quod solus ictus agnosceretur, accedit, quod signum ulterius obduci, quamdiu in corpore vixit, non potuit." At the second blow the axe broke.—ACTA SS. THIEMON, ap. CANISIUM, *Lect. antiq.*, vol. iv. p. 637.

[4] He was martyred in Palestine, Sept. 28, 1101.

with training courageous bishops, such as Gebhard and Thiemon, had also given a most powerful impulse to the internal and spiritual movement by which so many persons of both sexes and all ranks felt themselves drawn to embrace the monastic life in the character of lay brothers and sisters,[1] or to constitute themselves vassals of chapters or monasteries to which they rendered daily services, professing obedience towards the regular congregation.[2] Whole villages in Suabia were seen subjecting themselves to these voluntary obligations, and thus forming religious communities of a new kind.[3] Urban gave the apostolic sanction to this new manifestation of Catholic spirit, which had not failed to excite much criticism,[4] but the good effects of which he had been able himself to appreciate; for it alone consoled the Church for the coldness and defections which followed on the prolongation of the schism.[5] Besides this popular movement, the principal nobles of Suabia, in accord with Duke Welf and the Bavarians, maintained the cause of the Church, and succeeded in repulsing the domination of Frederic of Hohen-

[1] July 4, 1091.

[2] "His temporibus in regno Teutonico communis vita multis in locis floruit . . . etiam in laïcis se suisque ad eamdem communem vitam devotissime offerentibus. Qui, etsi habitu nec clerici nec monachi viderentur . . . se servos eorumdem pro Domino fecerunt. . . . Se et sua ad congregationes tam clericorum quam monachorum regulariter viventium devotissime contulerunt, ut sub eorum obedientia communiter vivere et eis servire mererentur. . . . Innumerabilis multitudo. . . . Eisque more ancillarum quotidiani servitii pensum devotissime persolverent: in ipsis quoque villis filiæ rusticorum innumeræ conjugis et sæculo renuntiare," &c.—BERNOLD., ad. ann. 1091. We recognise here the type of the third order, organised in the thirteenth century by St. Francis and St. Dominic.

[3] "In Alemannia potissimum . . . multæ villæ ex integro se religioni contra dederunt," &c.—*Ibid.*

[4] "Quosdam accepimus morem vestrorum cœnobiorum corrodent es quos laicos sæculo renuntiantes, &c. . . . suscipitis. Nos eamdem . . . sicut oculis nostris inspeximus, approbamus, sanctam et catholicam nominamus," &c.—*Ibid.* See also MABILL., *Ann. Ben.*, vol. v. book 68, No. 18.

[5] "Multo ex Catholicis in partem excommunicatorum avaritia decepti sponte sua se transtulerunt."—*Ibid.*

staufen, the emperor's son-in-law, whom Henry wished to impose upon them as Duke of Suabia. Thus was already begun the rivalry between the Guelfs and Ghibelines, which, after the elevation of Frederic's sons to the imperial throne, was to be, to a great extent, confounded with the permanent conflict between the emperor and the Church.[1] To oppose Frederic, and the intruded bishops who supported him, the Catholics elected Duke Berthold of Zähringen, brother of the legate Gebhard of Constance, and son-in-law of the orthodox King Rodolph, who had also been Duke of Suabia.[2] The Counts of Montfort, Hellenburg, Toggenburg, Kiburg, and Bregens, and all the grand vassals of the province,[3] solemnly recognised the two brothers Berthold as dukes, and Gebhard as legate, at the provincial diet at Ulm (1093). They there also proclaimed the truce of God until 1096, so as to protect monasteries, travellers, and merchants; and this clause gained them the assent even of the towns always devoted to the emperor. Every count caused it to be sworn to in his county, by all the nobles and freemen.[4] Alsace was kept in the right path by a regular canon named Manegald, so learned that he was surnamed *the master of the doctors*,[5] and already known by his writings in favour of Gregory VII. He caused almost the whole of the Alsatian nobility to abjure the schism, and to be publicly reconciled

[1] Those of Coire, Bale, Lausanne, and Strasburg. Alsace and German Switzerland were then comprehended in the Duchy of Suabia or Alamania.

[2] Berthold, son of Rodolph, had first been opposed to Frederic by the Catholics; but he died in 1090. Berthold of Zähringen, his brother-in-law, then replaced him. He was the founder of the present house of Baden.

[3] We may point out among the proofs of the Catholic dispositions of the Suabian feudatories at the time the foundation of the abbeys of Neresheim in 1095, by Hartmann, Count of Kyburg, and Adelaide his wife, and of Isny, in 1096, by the Counts of Wæringen.

[4] STENTZEL, vol. i. p. 549. PFEFFEL, *Histoire et droit public de l'Allemagne*, ann. 1092.

[5] ANON. MELLIC. *in Fabr. Bibl. Eccles.*, c. 105. BERTHOLD, ad ann. 1095–1098. *Hist. littér. de France*, vol. ix. pp. 280–288.

with the Holy See. The emperor vainly tried to win him over; furious, he threw Manegald into prison, where he kept him for a long time. This lengthened captivity was the reward of the unconquerable resistance Manegald had so long and so generously opposed to all attempts to corrupt him.[1]

Meanwhile Henry IV. had again started for Italy, the principal theatre of the war. The Catholic party there had been weakened, in 1089, by the death of two of its most valiant defenders—St. Peter Igneus, Cardinal-bishop of Albano;[2] and the heroic Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri, and afterwards of Placentia, martyred by the schismatics of his episcopal city, who first tore out his eyes, and then cut off his limbs one by one.[3] In September of this year Urban convoked a council of seventy bishops at Melfe,[4] where he published a series of canons, which were intended to confirm the sentences already pronounced against investitures, simony, the marriage of priests, and the presence of clergy at the court of princes,[5] and by which it was forbidden *to all ecclesiastical persons to become the vassals of laymen.*[6] In the same assembly, the pope received the homage and oath of fidelity of Roger, son of Robert Guiscard, to whom he

[1] "In causa S. Petri, ferventissimus."—BERTH., ad ann. 1089.

[2] See above, the manner in which he gained the surname of Igneus, July 14, 1089.

[3] BERTHOLD.

[4] Labbe and Pagi have proved that this Council, wrongly placed by Baronius in 1090, was held in 1089; and St. Marc (*Hist. d'Italie*, vol. iv. pp. 840–849) maintains, with justice, as it seems to us, that it is the same of which Berthold speaks as being held at Rome in this same year.

[5] "Clericorum acephalorum genus . . . qui in curiis morantur."—CAN. 9, ap. BARON. ann. 1090.

[6] "Ne gravamen aliquod sancta patiatur Ecclesia, nullum jus laicis in clericos esse volumus et censemus . . . si forte clericorum aliquis cujuslibet laicis possessionibus usus fuerit, aut vicarium qui debitum reddat, inveniat, aut possessione cadat, ne gravamen Ecclesiæ inferatur."—CAN. ii., *Ibid.* Urban, in this Council, responded to the complaints of several bishops, by forbidding the abbots to receive any new donations with exemptions; he confirmed all the old ones.—PAGI, *Crit.* in ann. 1090, n. 3.

confirmed the possession of the Duchy of Apulia, by placing in his hands the ducal banner.[1]

More and more assured of the help of the Normans, Urban devised a plan for uniting and arranging the forces of which the partisans of the orthodox Church could dispose in Italy and Germany. He persuaded the Countess Matilda to marry the young Welf, son of the Duke of Bavaria, one of the principal leaders of the German Catholics. The marriage was disproportioned, for Matilda was forty-three years of age and Welf only eighteen; but for the good of the Church, though against the will of the countess, it took place.[2] It was impossible that harmony should continue between the married pair; in the beginning, however, there was no disagreement between them. Welf showed himself, like his father, a vigorous champion of the pontifical cause, and became a source of great disquiet to the emperor,[3] who decided to return to Italy, where he hastened to seize all the possessions of Matilda to the north of the Alps.[4] He then went down into Lombardy (1090), invested Mantua, one of the chief cities of the countess's states, and made himself master of it after a siege of eleven months.[5]

The Romans of the imperial party again opened their gates to the anti-Pope Guibert, and for the third time since Gregory's death gained possession of Castle St. Angelo.

The Catholics were reduced to offer peace to the emperor; Duke Welf agreed to be reconciled to him if he would merely renounce Guibert, and restore the confiscated domains. Henry for the third time refused.[6] His triumph intoxicated him. The fall of Mantua soon brought about the submission of all Matilda's states north of the Po. Ferrara was taken by the

[1] "Ligius ejus homo effectus . . . accepit per vexillum ab eo terram cum ducatus honore."—ROMUALD, *Salern. Chr.*, ad ann. 1090.

[2] "Invitam licet, jam provectioris ætatis . . . nunquam voluit commisceri viro."—BARONIUS, ad. ann. 1089, n. 9.

[3] BERTHOLD. [4] DOMNIZO, vol. ii. p. 4. [5] April 12, 1091.

[6] BERNOLD, ad. ann. 1091.

troops of the emperor, who carried the war to the south of the river, and began to ravage the estates of Welf,[1] to punish him for his marriage with the countess, and his alliance with the Holy See.

Henry then made himself master of several fortresses belonging to Matilda, in the Modena country, and besieged Montevio, which was one of the most important of them.

These successes terrified most of the vassals of the countess, who obliged her to try negotiations. Henry promised peace on the single condition of her acknowledging the anti-Pope Guibert; but this condition was indignantly refused,[2] which proves clearly that the independence of the Church was the true object of the contest.

There was a conference held at Carpineta. Many bishops and monks were assembled there to examine the bases of a treaty. Bishop Heribert, of Reggio, insisted on the necessity of yielding to the emperor's victorious arms; but a monk, named John,[3] protested against this conclusion. "God forbid," he cried, addressing the countess, "that such a peace should be made, for it would be contrary to the honour of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit! Would you lose the fruit of so many efforts, so many labours, endured for Christ? Do not cease the battle; victory is there awaiting you; the prayers of St. Peter will obtain it from the Lord."[4]

[1] Welf was grandson and heir of Azo, Marquis of Ferrara.

[2] "Hoc audire quidem nolunt aures comitissæ."—DOMINZO, vol. ii. p. 7.

[3] Muratori proves that he was abbot of St. Apollonius at Canossa.—In not. ad. DOMNIZO, pp. 372, 373.

[4] "Absit ne fiat, quia pax hæc est inimica
Spiritui sancto, Patri, proprio quoque filio!
Ergo sudores amittes, atque labores
Tantos pro Christi quos nomine sustinuisti.
Ne titubes pugna, quoniam victoria multa
De prope de cœlo veniet tibi, dante sereno
Christo pro Petri precibus. . . ."

—DOMNIZO, vol. ii. p. 7.

The assembly, carried away by these words, cried out that it would be better to die than to treat with Henry.[1] Matilda, all whose wishes agreed with this resolution, was rewarded for her constancy; for the prophecy of John was soon fulfilled. The emperor's natural son was killed in attacking Montevio, and the emperor was forced to raise the siege. He tried to make up for this check by surprising Canossa,[2] and thus avenging the humiliation he thought he had suffered there at the feet of Gregory VII. But the inhabitants, encouraged by the prayers and hymns of John and his monks, defended it to the utmost.[3]

Henry then found himself forced to retreat, after having lost his banner, which, by Matilda's order, was hung in the church of Canossa, a glorious monument of the defeat of the perjured prince, who had carelessly forgotten all his promises of repentance, and thus robbed himself of the easy means of becoming the legitimate sovereign of Europe.

Before the winter of 1090, Matilda reconquered all that she had lost south of the Po. Henry was obliged to take refuge in Lombardy, where Welf kept him shut up, thus preventing his junction with the King of Hungary, whose help he expected.

Meanwhile Urban, driven from Rome by the success of the anti-pope, had sought shelter in the Campagna, in the ancient territory of the Samnites, under Norman protection. Without fixed abode, living on alms, but perhaps greater amidst the hazards and agitations of this fugitive life than in the lap of the splendid Roman Court, the Pope carried into the exercise of his pontifical duties a marvellous vigi-

[1] "Turba sacerdotum firmatur catholicorum.
Ante volunt lethum quam regis denique fœdus."
—Domnizo, vol. ii. p. 7.

[2] "At memor est factus Canossæ quæ mala passus. . . .
Nunc ulciscendi tempus se credidit ex his. . . ."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Cumque tubæ magnæ reboant, abbasque Joannes
Cum monachis psalmos psallebat. . . .
Abbas orabat, pugnabat plebs memorata. . . ."—*Ibid.*

lance and activity. He did not content himself with renewing, in a council held at Benevento,[1] the anathemas which his predecessors had fulminated against the emperor and the anti-pope; he also interposed daily in the general government of Christendom, by diplomas, by legations, by audiences granted to the numerous pilgrims who followed his steps in his exile, or by the dedication of churches, which rose in all parts of the country where he found an asylum.[2] That magnificent country, extending from the Bay of Naples to that of Taranto, contained, besides Salerno, Amalfi, Monte Cassino, La Cava, and many other places eternally associated with the glory of the Roman republic. Lately opened to northern Europe by the exploits of the Normans, this happy land was, as it were, *consecrated* in the eyes of all Christians by the residence and death of Gregory VII., and also by the fact that it served afterwards for the abode and sanctuary of the series of great popes who followed Hildebrand.

No Catholic traveller can pass through these scenes, embellished by all the magic of nature and all the souvenirs of history, without remembering that it was amidst them that those fugitive but indomitable pontiffs who vanquished the world, and saved the Church in the most terrible crisis of its history, renewed their courage. Salerno, above all, must have attracted Urban II.; for, as he said, in a solemn diploma, to the archbishop placed over the see, "You have already the body of the Apostle St. Matthew, and those of the holy martyrs Fortunatus and his companions; and now, in our days, God has deigned to confer upon you a new glory from the exile and the tomb of that Gregory of apostolic memory, whose uprightness, learning, and marvellous constancy are proclaimed by the Roman Church, confessed

[1] March 28, 1091.

[2] Side by side with the constant largesses of the Norman conquerors to monasteries, we must point out, by way of contrast, the oppressions which Count William Tassio inflicted on the abbey of Casa Auria.—MABILLON, *Ann.*, i. 691, No. 85.

by the whole West, and proved by the fall of vanquished tyrants." [1]

Meanwhile the new church of the monastery of La Cava was finished. Urban went to consecrate it,[2] accompanied by Duke Roger and a crowd of bishops,[3] cardinals, clergy, and laymen. In a bull addressed to the Abbot Peter,[4] the Pope again bore witness to his reverence for the memory of Gregory VII., and his zeal for monastic liberty:—

"Firmly attached to the institutions of our predecessor Gregory, who had so much affection for this monastery, who brought you from the famous house of Cluny to be its abbot, and who so well secured the liberty of this house and its dependencies, that to this day it has remained free from all human yoke, we, in our turn, confer upon it, by this privilege, an absolute liberty with regard to all persons, secular or ecclesiastic." [5] He then enumerates the different indulgences and exemptions which he grants to the monks,[6]—favours, whose object indeed was only to better guarantee the exact performance of all monastic duties.

Duke Roger also associated himself with the Pope's work.

[1] "Apposuit etiam Deus tertii muneris claritatem ut eam nostris temporibus Gregorii apostolicæ memoriæ VII. papæ tam exilio quam tumulo illustraret. Cujus quam egregia jura (?) quam præclara doctrina quam miranda constantia fuerit, Romana Ecclesia prædicat, Occidens universus agnoscit, tyrannorum pertinacia tolerat, et conculcata testatur."—COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 735.

[2] September 5, 1092.

[3] Eight bishops, eight cardinals—". . . cum immunera clericorum et laicorum turba."—BARON., ad ann. 1092, No. 18.

[4] The holy abbot had refused to wear the mitre which Urban, in full council, had sent to him.—*Ibid.*, ad ann. 1091, No. 2.

[5] "Prædecessoris nostri . . . institutis tenacius adhærentes, cavent cœnobium, quod ipse singulariter dilexit. . . . Cluniacum locum illum famosum dirigens inde te ut abbatem . . . adscivit, &c. . . . Nos quoque hujus nostri privilegii pagina communimus, et ab omnis tam sæcularis quam Ecclesiasticæ personæ jugo liberam omnino esse decernimus."—BARON., *loc. cit.*

[6] He granted to the abbot the right of consecrating churches in the vast domains of the abbey, and many other privileges, which may be seen in the diploma, ap. BARON., and COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 722–727.

He granted to the monastery the tithe of the sea-fishery, guaranteed the independence of its jurisdiction, and confirmed, in advance, all gifts or cessions of fiefs which his barons or vassals might wish to make to it. Leo, a holy abbot of La Cava, who had been repulsed with harshness by Gisulf, the last Lombard Prince of Salerno, when he came to beg the pardon of three condemned prisoners, had foretold to the prince that he would soon cease to reign.[1] Robert Guiscard and his Normans shortly afterwards undertook to accomplish this prediction. Their new chief, no doubt remembering the circumstance, conferred on the abbots of La Cava the perpetual right of pardoning those condemned to death or other penalties, throughout his duchy, and specially those whom they might meet on the way to execution.[2]

This was the privilege which the Romans granted to vestals, and it reappeared, in the criminal law of Christian knights, as a tribute to true devotion and holy virginity.[3]

1 "Dum ad mensam cum fratribus sederet, tristis nuntius affuit, qui venerando viro tres homines privari lumine jussos a principe indicavit, et ejulans atque exclamans subjunxit, dicens: Curre, pater, curre, quia jam miseri producuntur. . . . Pro crudelitate tua post parum temporis, hujus terræ dominus non eris."—*Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix. p. 379. St. Leo died in 1079, and Robert Guiscard dethroned Gisulf in 1075.

2 "Concessit etiam vobis in perpetuum, ut in quacumque parte sui ducatus, tu vel tui successores personaliter fueritis, et unus vel plures homines ibi fuerint ad mortem, vel ad quodlibet supplicium judicati, possitis eos, sicut volueritis, liberare et ubicumque per suum ducatum transitum feceritis, obviosque habueritis in vestro transitu condemnatos qui ad suspendium vel decollationis supplicium deportentur, valeatis eos, si vobis placuerit, facere liberari." This privilege, with others granted by Roger, are inserted in the Pope's bull, ap. BARON., and COLETTI, *loc. cit.*

3 This same privilege had been granted to the Abbot of Glastonbury in England, and to the Abbess of Lindau, on Lake Constance.—HURTER, iii. 462. The Catholic spirit, so inexhaustible and so varied in its affectionate skill in the things of God, reproduced, with admirable similarity, the same fruits in the most distant places. The Reformation and modern policy have freed the world from these anomalies. The privilege here alluded to was abolished in a characteristic manner conformably to the spirit of the Reformation, when Henry VIII. caused the last Abbot of Glastonbury to be quartered at the door of his monastery, Nov. 14, 1538, for denying that the king was the visible head of the Church.

The Normans gloriously continued their mission. Count Roger, brother of Robert Guiscard, and uncle of the young Duke of Apulia, had just completed the conquest of Sicily, then held by the Saracens.[1] He immediately occupied himself with the establishment of bishoprics and monasteries there: Palermo, Messina, Catania, Agrigento, Syracusa, and Chazzara were made bishops' sees by the pope, at the victor's request, and most of them received as their first bishops monks from Normandy, sharers in the first conquests of their race in Italy.

Urban, by the care he devoted to the regulation of these different foundations, deserved to be considered the restorer of the Church in Sicily.[2] At the same time he raised the city of Pisa to metropolitan rank, and presented to it the island of Corsica, doing this at the request of Matilda, and in gratitude for the services rendered to the Holy See by this Republic, and for its victories over the Saracens.[3] The cares of the sovereign pontiff were not bounded by Italy and its dependencies; their wide extent is proved by the many deeds,[4] dated from these years of exile which relate to monastic affairs, and the liberty of episcopal elections in France and elsewhere.[5] At the very moment when the emperor, crossing the Alps, seemed about to fetter the papacy more than at any time since the death of Gregory VII., Urban was able to reunite to the Holy See, by the closest

[1] By the surrender of Castro Giovanni, 1091.

[2] FLEURY, b. 64, No. 14. We refer to the learned dissertation of Cardinal Baronius on the subject of the pretended ecclesiastical rights conferred upon Count Roger by Urban—rights which were, later, the object of such grave dispute.—*Ann.*, ad ann. 1097, No. 18–143.

[3] Bulls of June 28, 1091, and April 22, 1092, ap. FLEURY, b. 64, No. 8.

[4] *In re* Cluny, Amiens, Marmoutier, Séez, Crespin, &c. He had, above all, defended the immunities of Fécamp against the Archbishop of Rouen, himself a monk, but not the only bishop sprung from a monastery, and unfaithful to his origin. Happily the pope-monks never yielded to this tendency.

[5] Ep. 19, ad abbat. Fiscamn. See also Ep. 33, ad. Lamb., ap. Atrebat., No. 40.

bonds, two Frenchmen whose influence and services were destined to honour and fortify the Church—Bishop Yves of Chartres, and St. Bruno, founder of the Carthusian Order. Yves was not a monk, but he had been the pupil of Lanfranc at Bec, and being placed at the head of a community of regular canons at St. Quentin of Beauvais, he had preserved during his whole career a lively recollection of the peace and spiritual pleasures of the cloister. He had composed a vast collection of canon law, known under his name,[1] and which retained great authority until the publication of the famous decretals of Gratian. When Bishop Geoffrey of Chartres had been deposed after a long process at the Court of Rome, as guilty of simony, concubinage, and treason, Yves was chosen to replace him by the unanimous suffrages of the clergy and people of Chartres.[2] King Philip of France acknowledged him; but not so the metropolitan Richer, Archbishop of Sens, who, being a partisan of Geoffrey, refused to consecrate Yves. The latter was obliged to go to the pope, who himself consecrated him at Capua,[3] and sent him back to France with a letter to the inhabitants of Chartres, in which he enjoined them to receive the prelate, as consecrated by the hands of St. Peter himself.[4] And as Richer, far from yielding to the judgment of the supreme authority, wrote an injurious letter to the new prelate, in which he seemed scarcely to allow the validity of his consecretion,[5] Yves replied by an ardent vindication of the Holy See, and by declaring all those who did not respect it to be heretics.[6] Richer in vain tried to obtain

[1] "Decretum Yvonis Carnotensis."

[2] He had to be forced to accept it. He wrote to the pope that he was not noble enough to be a bishop.—Ep. 3. It is not known on what authority his biographer, Fronteau, wrote of him, "*a nobili sanguine nobilem animum traxit.*"—*Vit. Yvon.*, in ed. Paris, 1647.

[3] In 1090, according to PAGI; 1091 according to MABILL., b. 68, No. 27.

[4] "Tanquam B. Petri manibus consecratum."—*Ep. Yvon.* 1.

[5] "Non simpliciter benedictionem, sed qualemcumque hostili irrisione appellastis."—*Ep. Yvon.* 28.

[6] "Cujus judiciis et constitutionibus obviare plane est hæreticæ pravitatis notam incurrere."—*Ibid.* Urban II. had shortly afterwards to

his deposition by a provincial council, as having acted to the prejudice of the royal authority in going to Rome to be consecrated. Yves retained his episcopal see, where we soon find him in the first rank of champions of the authority and discipline of the Church.

Bruno, born at Cologne, of a noble and warlike race,[1] had been canon and schoolmaster of Rheims, where he taught Greek, Hebrew, and theology, and where he counted among his pupils the young noble of that country who afterwards became pope under the name of Urban II. To avoid the dignity of Archbishop of Rheims, which was pressed upon him, Bruno renounced teaching and the world. Accompanied by his friends, two of whom were laymen, and the third a foreigner,[2] he went to beg a retreat with Hugh, Bishop of Grenoble, who had been his pupil at Rheims, and become a monk at Chaise-Dieu.

On the eve of their arrival at Grenoble, Hugh dreamed that he was transported to the midst of the mountains of Dauphiné, in the most savage and inaccessible part of his diocese. In his vision he seemed to see rising on the broken rocks a magnificent temple, while seven stars, coming from afar, paused over the roof of the building and flooded it with their light. Next day, when Hugh saw seven travellers arrive, led by his old master Bruno, he understood that the vision was to warn him of their coming, and he himself led them to the place pointed out by the apparition of the seven stars.[3]

arrange a similar difficulty in favour of Lambert, elected at Arras by the clergy of the recently restored see. In spite of the strong opposition of the clergy of Cambrai (on which Arras had till then depended), and that of the King of France and the emperor, the metropolitan having been unwilling to consecrate him, Lambert went to Rome, and Urban himself consecrated him, March 19, 1094.

[1] It is said that his family bore the name of *Hartenfaust* or *Strongfisted*.

[2] Landuin of Tuscany, who succeeded him as Prior of the Chartreuse.

[3] I purposely abridge the story of the foundation of the Chartreuse, a story which has become popular, thanks to the pencil of Lesueur and the twenty-two masterpieces with which this great painter had decorated the

They could arrive there only by crossing forests and precipices, so difficult of access, that they risked their lives on the journey; and when they did arrive, they found merely a narrow plateau surrounded by pines, dominated by steep mountains, and perpetually swept by avalanches.[1] The travellers joyfully established themselves there, built an oratory and some cabins of branches, and gave themselves entirely to contemplation, peace, and the love of God. This solitude was called the Chartreuse, and this was the origin of the order of Carthusians (Chartreux),[2] who at first bore the honourable title of *Christ's Poor*. By a mysterious exercise of the Divine Will, of all the monasteries which covered France, the Chartreuse alone has escaped the common and sacrilegious destruction.

The new-comers bound themselves to follow the rule of St. Benedict, but restored it to its primitive rigour, and modified it to a more hermit-like fashion. Isolated cells within the boundaries of the monastery were substituted for the common refectory and dormitory; each of the thirteen monks (the number to which those of each house were strictly limited) inhabited one of them, where he ate, slept, and worked in solitude.

They had few common services; the conventual mass was only celebrated on Sundays and feast-days. On these occasions the solitaries permitted themselves the use of fish and cheese;[3] at other times their sole nourishment was bran bread and vegetables. They cultivated but little of the sterile soil of their mountains, and lived only on

cloister of the Chartreuse at Paris, whence they were transported to the Louvre after the sacrilegious destruction of the monastery.

[1] On January 30, 1133, the cloister and cells of the first monastery, situated where the chapel of Notre Dame de *Casalibus* now stands, were buried, together with seven monks, by the fall of an avalanche. It was after this that the monastery was built on its present site.

[2] In 1084, *Pauperes Christi*, DUCANGE; V°. *Pauper*, PAGI, *Crit.*, ad ann. 1086.

[3] Prior Guigues says so expressly in the preamble to his statutes.—Ap. MABILL., vol. v. b. 66, No. 65.

the produce of their flocks; it was forbidden to them to preach.

The transcription of MSS., and above all that of Holy Scripture, was their principal occupation. "We will thus," said their statutes, "preach the Word of God, not by our lips, but by the work of our hands."[1]

Count William of Nevers, who was destined to end his life as one of them, having gone to visit them from devotion, was so touched by their poverty that on his return he sent them a costly set of plate. They returned it to him; but they gratefully accepted the parchments which he gave them afterwards,[2] and which they used in forming the rich library they shortly afterwards organised.[3] This new branch of the Monastic Orders was in reality a rehabilitation of the eremitic life of the first Fathers of the Desert, but sheltered from the dangers of an absolute solitude. Austere as the system was, it excited not only the emulation of all monks, but also the admiration and envy of all laymen. Great troops of men, women, and even children[4] were seen, says a contemporary, soliciting admission into the new fold of penitence and divine love. Meantime the number of houses was, at first, very limited. Bruno had lived six years at the Chartreuse, when an order of the pope drew him thence. Urban, amidst all the storms of his pontificate, had determined to call his old friend to the help of the Church; in 1090, therefore, he enjoined him to come to him,[5] and kept him near to himself during the whole of his stay in Italy, seeking assistance in all the papal councils from his know-

[1] "Ut quod ore non possumus, Dei verbum manibus prædicamus."—*Statut. Guigon.* xxvii., 4, ap. HURTER, iii. 578.

[2] "Boum coria et pergamena plurima quæ ad scribendos libros eis necessaria cognoverat."—GUIB. NOVIG., *Vit.* i. c. 21.

[3] "Ditissimam bibliothecam coaggerant."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Greges virorum feminarumque et immo decennes et undecennes infantuli."—GUIB. NOVIG., *Vit.* i. c. 29.

[5] "Per litteras ad S. Ecclesiæ præstanda officia graviter præcipiens, ne venire ad urbem cunctaretur."—*Vit. S. Brun.*, ap. SURIUM, c. 16.

ledge and his affection.[1] Count Roger of Sicily, who shared the special regard felt by Norman nobles for monks, disputed with the pope the possession of Bruno, and loaded him with marks of his generosity and tender affection. In vain he offered to the Carthusian the Archbishopric of Reggio; but when the saint, wearied of the life he led at the Roman Court,[2] had obtained his liberty, he accepted from the hands of the Count a monastery in Calabria,[3] to which the pope allowed him to retire. Bruno soon quitted his solitude to go and baptize the son of Roger, who was one day to be the first Christian king of the Two Sicilies, and to receive the last sighs of the illustrious Count to whom is due the honour of having founded this kingdom. The saint died four months after his friend,[4] and the whole Church mourned him who had enriched her with a new legion of soldiers and saints.

Meantime, with the year 1093 there seemed to open a more favourable phase of the Catholic cause. The emperor, scarcely recovered from the defeat of Canossa, sustained a still more cruel misfortune in the defection of his eldest son Conrad, whom he had already caused to be crowned King

[1] "Papam solatio et consilio in Ecclesiasticis negotiis juvaturus."—*De institut. ord. Cartusiens.*, ap. LABBE, Bibl. i. 638. "Ejus opera usus in celebrandis consiliis."—BARON., ad ann. 1092, No. 12. These relations suggested to Zurbaran one of his finest pictures; the pope and the saint in the dress of the time are represented alone, seated face to face. This masterpiece of the monastic painter, *par excellence*, was taken to the new museum at Seville when the Chartreuse of that city was changed into a china factory by a greedy manufacturer, who does not even allow strangers to visit the place he has profaned.

[2] "Cum tumultus et mores curiæ ferre non posset, relicitis solitudinis et quietis amore flagrans."—BARONIUS. After the Council of Placentia in 1085.

[3] La Torre, near Squillace. The saint drew the most charming picture of it in his letter to Raoul le Vert, Archbishop of Rheims. See the deed in which Roger recounts the causes of his confidence in, and gratitude towards Bruno.—BARON., ad ann. 1097, c. 14; SURIUS, vol. v., die 5th Oct.

[4] October 6, 1101. It is known that the Carthusian Order, by a unique exception, has never needed to be reformed.

of the Romans. This young prince, whose pious and pacific disposition is praised by all his contemporaries, was revolted by the sight of his father's crimes; above all, he was horrified by the odious attempts of the tyrant upon the person of his second wife, Adelaide of Russia.[1] An unnatural father, as well as an unworthy husband, Henry IV. had wished to make Conrad, the stepson of the victim, his accomplice.[2] Carried away by the most righteous indignation, the young prince fled and joined Matilda and her husband Welf, who were carrying on the war against Henry. Conrad fell, a few months later, into the hands of his father, who caused him to be imprisoned; but he succeeded in escaping, and being received with transport by the pontifical party, he was proclaimed King of the Lombards by the Archbishop of Milan. At the same time Matilda succeeded in rescuing Adelaide from the prison where Henry kept her at Verona.[3] The persecutor of the Church had thus to undergo a double punishment; his wife and son had both escaped, and having sought refuge in the ranks of his adversaries, raised their accusing voices to reveal the horrible mysteries of the tyrant's private life. His despair may be imagined; it was so great that some thought he would kill himself.[4] There was also a

[1] Some authors call her Praxeda; she was the daughter of the Czar of Russia. He had married her in 1093, she being then widow of the Margrave of Brandenburg. He himself had lost his first wife Bertha, the mother of Conrad, who at this time was nineteen years old.

[2] "Incarceraverat eam, et concessit ut plerique vim ei inferrent, immo filium hortans, ut eam subagitaret. Quo recusante patris polluere stratum, eum Rex non suum sed peregrini filium esse affirmavit."—ALBERT STEDENS, *Chron. in Schittir. scriptor.*; HERMOLD., *Chron. Slavor.*, ed. 1659; DODECHIN., ad ann. 1093; in PISTOR., *Script. Germ.*, vol. i., and ap. BARON., &c. This terrible story, upon which Henry's apologists throw doubts, is only too much in harmony with acts of the same kind with which the insurgent Germans always reproached Henry (see above, the letter of the Count of Thuringia); it is, besides, confirmed by the public declarations of the empress at the Councils of Constance and Placentia, as we shall see.

[3] DOMNIZO, ii. 8.

[4] "In quamdam munitionem se contulit, ibique diu absque regia dig-

violent reaction against the prince in the very heart of that Lombardy which, for several years, had been the chief seat of his operations. The great towns of the country declared against him, others announced that redoubtable municipal league, which, a century later, was to be the bulwark of the Church and of Italian liberty against a new race of emperors. Milan, Lodi, Cremona, and Placentia swore to remain friends for twenty years, and concluded an offensive alliance against the emperor, the duration of which was also to be twenty years; their soldiers, united to those of Matilda and Welf, occupied the passes of the Alps to prevent the arrival of Henry's German allies.[1] In Germany a similar movement broke out in the towns which hitherto had furnished to the emperor his most zealous partizans; the burghers of Augsburg, Metz, Toul, and Verdun, drove out the bishops whom the schismatics had placed over them. These great news came to Urban in the depths of Apulia, at Traja, where he had just held his annual council,[2] and they brought him back to Rome, where he was able to celebrate the feast of Christmas (1093). Guibert was with the emperor in Lombardy;[3] but his followers still occupied the greater part of the city, and especially Castle St. Angelo, the Lateran, and the bridges over the Tiber. The pope, concealed in the fortified house of John Frangipani,[4] was reduced to almost complete destitution, and loaded with debts.[5] The account

nitate moratus, nimioque dolore affectus, seipsum ut aiunt morti tradere voluit, sed a suis præventus, ad effectum venire non potuit."—BERNOLD., ad ann. 1093.

[1] "In viginti annos, conjuraverunt contra Henricum."—*Ibid.*

[2] March 11, 1093. There were seventy bishops and eleven abbots as at Melfi in 1089. This council published several canons as to degrees of consanguinity, and on the means of maintaining God's truce, &c.

[3] BERNOLD., ad ann. 1094.

[4] "In domo Joannis Fricapanem latitare."—GOTFRID. VINDOCIN., Ep. 8. "In quadam firmissima munitione, prope Sanctam Mariam novam."—BERNOLD., *loc. cit.*

[5] "Pene omnibus bonis temporalibus nudatum, et alieno ære nimis oppressum inveni."—GOFF. VENDOC., *loc. cit.*

of this distress having reached the ears of a young Angevin noble named Geoffrey,[1] he, though as yet only a novice, started immediately with all the resources he could collect, to go to the pontiff's help, and reached him at night, in disguise, after braving a thousand dangers. A fortnight before Easter (1094) Ferruccio, who occupied the Lateran in Guibert's name, offered to give the palace up to the pope for a fixed price; but as neither Urban himself, nor the cardinals and bishops of his party had the means of paying, Abbot Geoffrey sold his horses and mules, and sent the price, with all that he possessed, to the sovereign pontiff, who was thus able to satisfy Ferruccio. The doors of the Lateran were thus opened to Geoffrey, who had the privilege of being the first to kiss the feet of Urban II., re-established on the throne which no orthodox pope had occupied since the exile of St. Gregory VII.[2]

Urban then went to Tuscany, summoned by Matilda, who was following up the success already obtained against the Imperialists. She brought to Rome the unfortunate empress, who, prostrate before the common father of the faithful, related to him the shameful crimes of which she had been the victim.[3] Already in an assembly of German princes and prelates, held at Constance by the legate Gebhard,[4] the empress

[1] He was son of Henry Seigneur du Lion d'Angers, and grandson of the Seigneur du Craon, and a princess of France.—*Hist. Litt. de France*, vol. xi. p. 177. He was consecrated abbot by Yves de Chartres, August 24, 1093.

[2] "Flens accessi ad eum dicens ut secure cum Ferruccio iniret pactum. Ibi aurum et argentum, nummos, mulas et equos expendi: et sic Lateranense habuimus, et intravimus Palatium. Ubi ego primus osculatus sum Domini papæ pedem, in sede videlicet apostolica, in qua longe ante catholicus non sederat papa."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Quæ susceptam reginam ad venerabilem perduxit Urbanum. . . . Cujus provoluta pedibus, profusis lacrymis ac intimis singultibus omnem suæ, quam pertulerat, calamitatis intimavit miseriam."—DODECHINUS, *loc. cit.*

[4] At Easter, 1094. This council forbade people, under pain of excommunication, to be present at the services of the simoniacal or married priests.

had denounced the outrages which she had endured from her unworthy husband.[1] She renewed these terrible accusations before the most solemn tribunal in the world, at the general council convoked by the pope at Placentia, in the midst of the district formerly most infected by the Imperialist schism (March 1095).[2] To this solemn assembly came the bishops of Italy, France, Burgundy, and Germany, to the number of 200, more than 4000 clerks and monks, and 30,000 laymen. No church being able to contain such a crowd, the council had to be held in the open air outside the town. Adelaide appeared, and after a public confession of the horrible excesses to which her husband had condemned her, she obtained absolution for the involuntary part she had taken in them,[3] while a new excommunication was fulminated against her unworthy husband.[4] Meantime King Philip of France, who

[1] "Querimonia Praxedis reginæ . . . pervenit, quæ se tantas tamque inauditas fornicationum spurcitias, et a tantis passam fuisse conquesta est, ut etiam apud inimicos fugam suam facillime excusaret, omnesque catholicos ad compassionem tantarum injuriarum sibi conciliaret."—BERNOLD., ad ann. 1094.

[2] "In media Longobardia inter ipsos schismaticos et contra ipsos."—BERNOLD., ad ann. 1095. "Primus erat mensis quo nascitur humor in herbis."—DOMNIZO, ii. 8.

[3] "Cujus querimoniam Dominus Papa cum S. Synodo satis misericorditer suscepit, eo quod ipsam tantas spurcitias non tam commisisse quam invitam pertulisse pro certo cognoverit. Unde et de pœnitentia pro hujusmodi flagitiis injungenda illam absolvit. BERNOLD., *loc. cit.* Henricum denuo excommunicavit pro illicitis ac nefandis, omnibusque sæculis inauditis rebus in legitima uxore perpetratis."—DODECHIN., *loc. cit.* Adelaide returned to Russia, where she ended her days in a cloister.

[4] Among Henry's contemporary apologists, one only (*Vit., Henric.*, Anon., ap. Urstir) accuses Matilda of having won over the young King Conrad; and they all keep prudent silence as to the overwhelming accusations of Adelaide. Protestant historians are less embarrassed, and show themselves only the more disposed to defend their hero. Let us take, for example, among the most learned of the moderns, MM. Lüden and Stentzel. Lüden, to explain the double accusation of wife and son, invents the most extraordinary explanation. According to him, Conrad and Adelaide must have been carried off from Verona by Matilda, who, in league with the pope, taught them their lesson, and dictated to Adelaide the infamous accusation she was to bring against her husband. He quotes no contemporary autho-

had been excommunicated the previous year for bigamy, in a council held at Autun, had been cited before that of Placentia; but he asked a delay, which the pope granted. The ambassadors of Alexis Comnenus, emperor of the East, came thither also to beg humbly from the pope and Christians of the West some help against the infidels who were already menacing Constantinople. Urban, without making an obstacle of the schism which was infecting the Byzantine Church, exhorted the Catholics to give this help, and many engaged themselves by oath in the enterprise.

The council afterwards regulated a number of points of discipline, and renewed the previous condemnations against the heresy of Bérenger and against simoniacs and married priests. The pope then went to Cremona, where the young King Conrad joined him, served as his squire on his entrance to the city, and took an oath of fidelity to him. Urban

rity whatever in his short but laborious dissertation on the subject, b. xix. c. 11, No. 17, vol. ix.: "I cannot," he says, "understand the matter otherwise." This is a satisfactory reason to give to a conscientious reader! Thus the pope, the Countess Matilda, the empress, the young king, the council of German princes and prelates at Constance, the general council of Placentia, and contemporary historians, must all have been dupes or instruments of an abominable pretence! This hypothesis is accepted as more admissible than the crime of a single man, because this man, in this quality as enemy of the Church, was one of the precursors of modern wisdom! M. Lüden cannot understand it otherwise! As to M. Stentzel (vol. i. p. 552), he does not seek to deny the fact; but, like Lüden (vol. ix. p. 246), he feels indignation not at the crimes committed by Henry against the person of his wife, but at the effrontery of the latter, who dared to complain openly in a council! "It may be," he says, to excuse not the victim but the executioner, "that this woman, being of a colder nature (she was a Russian), may have felt a repugnance for the excessive voluptuousness to which her husband subjected her." These incredible words should be quoted in the original: "Es mag seyn dass dieser Frau von kælterm Blute die auschereifende Wolluste zuwider war, zu der sie von Ihrem Gemahl genusbraucht werden mœchte." So that if she had had the warm blood of a Spaniard or Italian, nothing would have been more simple! This is how history is written! Is not this a case to recall the words of the Count de Maistre, referring to writers of this school, "*They have no sympathy for anything but crime*"?

received the prince as a son of the Roman Church,[1] and promised to help him to obtain the imperial crown on condition of his renouncing the right of investiture. He then betrothed him to the daughter of Count Roger of Sicily, so that the three powers of the Church party in Italy—Matilda, the Normans, and the young king—found themselves united by new bonds. This happy position of affairs[2] allowed the pope to travel into France, whither most important matters called him.

[1] "Officium stratoris exhibuit. . . . In filium S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ recepit."—BERN., ann. 1095.

[2] "Rebus in Longobardia bene dipositis."—*Ibid.*

CHAPTER II

YVES DE CHARTRES AND THE PURITY OF MARRIAGE

Yves de Chartres protests against the adultery of the King of France.—Indomitable firmness of the Bishop of Chartres.—The legate Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons, also defends the laws of marriage.—Triumph of Yves de Chartres in defence of the purity of marriage, and the equality of duties between the two sexes.—Piety survives among women.—They pay the debt of their mothers.

In 1092, King Philip of France was so completely seduced by the beauty and artifices of Bertrade de Montfort,[1] wife of Fulk le Réchin, Count of Anjou, that he repudiated his lawful wife Bertha,[2] by whom he had already four children, and carried Bertrade off from her husband, to marry her himself.

The Bishop of Senlis[3] had had the criminal weakness to bless this unlawful marriage, and other prelates of the

[1] "Conscia nobilitatis et pulchritudinis suæ."—Ord. Vital., vii. 699. This historian adds that, fearing to be sent away by her husband, as his two previous wives had been, Bertrade sent an agent to the king to induce him to carry her off. She was daughter of the Count of Montfort and Agnes d'Evreux.

[2] Bertha was daughter of the Count of Friesland and Holland. Her misfortunes had been foretold to her as a punishment for the crime she had committed in expelling Abbot Gerald from the monastery of St. Medard. "*Si tu fratrem Geraldum hinc ejeceris, Deo vindice, tu quoque ante tuum obitum e regno extruderis, contemptaque et ærumnosa morieris.*" She died, in fact, two years after her repudiation, exiled to Montreuil in Ponthieu "*illic plebeio more defunctam et sepultam.*"—*Vit. S. Arnulph.*, in *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix

[3] Not, as Ordericus Vitalis says, the Bishop of Bayeux. See Pagi, *Crit.*, in ann. 1094.

kingdom, invited by the king, seemed to act as accomplices,[1] when Yves de Chartres, who had already protested by his absence, thought it his duty to address directly to Philip and the bishops the following remonstrance:

"Most magnificent lord, Philip, King of the French, I, Yves, the humble bishop of the Chartrains, ardently desire that you should govern your terrestrial kingdom so that you may not deserve to be banished from the eternal kingdom. I will once more say to your serenity from a distance what I have already said *vivâ voce*—I neither can nor will assist at your marriage until I have learned, by the decision of a council, whether your divorce and your new union are lawful. . . . Out of respect for my conscience, which I desire to keep pure before God, and that I may preserve the good fame which a priest of Christ ought to be honoured with before the faithful, I would rather be thrown into the depths of the sea with a millstone round my neck than be a stumbling-block to the weak. And when I speak thus, far from failing in the fidelity I owe to you, I give you the greatest proof of it; for I think you are exposing your soul to the gravest peril, and your crown to a real danger."[2]

The prelate sent copies of this letter to the other bishops invited, with a circular, in which he spoke to them thus: "You have the same reason as I for not assisting at this scandalous marriage. Do not then be like dumb dogs, unable to bark; but, on the contrary, show yourselves good guardians, and seeing the enemy approach, blow your trumpets, and take your swords in hand."[3]

[1] "Et quod scelestius est, invenit Galliarum episcopos, qui foverint adeo nefandis criminibus, uno contradicente omnibus illis Yvone."—BARON., ad ann. 1094, c. 10.

[2] "Domino suo Philippo, &c., sic militare in regno terreno ut non privetur æterno. . . . Malo cum mola asinaria in profundum mergi, quam per me mentibus infirmorum tanquam cœco offendiculum poni. Nec ista contra fidelitatem vestram, sed pro summa fidelitate dicere me arbitror," &c.—YVO., *Ep.* 15, ed. Fronto.

[3] "Nolite fieri canes muti, latrare non valentes, sed sicut boni specula-

The king, answering that all had been settled by the Archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans, Yves wrote to this metropolitan to exhort him not to shrink from the duty of his office, declaring that, for his part, he would rather lose the name and dignity of a bishop than by prevarication scandalise the flock of Christ.[1] The king, irritated by this resistance, ordered the prelate's domains to be ravaged, and caused him to be imprisoned by Hugh, Lord of Puiset, Viscount of Chartres. History describes this captivity as being so severe that the prisoner even wanted bread.[2] The people were much irritated, but Yves absolutely forbade his friends to attempt to release him by force, as they had thought of doing.

"Without God's will," he wrote, "neither you nor any one would be able to give me my liberty. Not having obtained the episcopate by violence, it is not by violence that I ought to be restored to it."[3]

The pope, being informed of what was passing, wrote to the bishops of the province of Rheims that they should recall the king to a better mind. "Even if he repulse you," said the pontiff, "it is better for you and me that we should vindicate the divine law from the outrage it has suffered, and that we should pierce these adulterous Midianites with the sword of Phineas."[4]

Urban did yet more; he enjoined the bishops to demand the release of Yves de Chartres, and to excommunicate the

tores, videntes gladium venientem super terram, buccina insonate."—YVO., *Ep.* 14.

[1] "Malo enim perpetuo nomine et officio Episcopi carere, quam pusillum gregem Domini mei legis prævaricatione scandalizare."—*Id.*, *Ep.* 13.

[2] "Damna quæ mihi usque ad penuriam panis inflicta sunt."—*Id.*, *Ep.* 22, HILDEB., *Cænom.*, *ep.* 100. "In quodam castello quo frangat animum, ni saxo fortior esset."—FRONTON., *Vit. Yvon.*

[3] "Quare ne fiat prohibeo, interdico. Nec enim incendiis domorum, deprædationibus pauperum potestis Dominum placare. . . ."—*Ep.* 20.

[4] "Quod si contempserit et vobis et nobis, necessitas imminebit ut ad ulciscendas divinæ legis injurias pro nostri officii debito accingamur, et Phineas gladio Madianitas adulteros perforemus."—Letter of the 27th October 1092, ap. COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 757.

king if he should refuse it. Philip did not dismiss his mistress; but Yves succeeded in leaving his prison without the vigour of his iron will having been weakened by his captivity.[1] In vain did the king persuade the prelate to come to him to assist at a provincial council convoked at Rheims, where he had the more hopes of obtaining sanction for his marriage, because Bertha was now dead. Yves answered the prince by reminding him of the sentence already pronounced by the pope against his union with Bertrade: "It is out of regard for your majesty," he added, "that I refrain from appearing in your presence, lest I should be obliged, in conformity with the injunction of the Apostolic See, which I must obey as Christ Himself, to speak aloud all that I now say to you in private."[2]

On the other hand, to his old adversary, Richer, Archbishop of Sens, the prelate wrote in these words: "They accuse me of having attacked the royal majesty; but let me say to you that this reproach attaches much more justly to those who have recourse to powerless remedies instead of at once cauterising the wound. If you had been as firm as I, our sick man would long ago have been cured. It is for you to consider whether, by your delays, you fulfil your obligations towards him, and the duties of your position. As for me, I am ready to suffer all the penalties our lord the king may be willing or able to inflict on me with God's permission. Let him imprison, banish, or persecute me; with the help of heavenly grace, I am resolved to suffer for the law of my God, and nothing shall be able to force me to shut my eyes to the sin of him whose chastisement I am determined not to share."[3]

[1] "Ferreum Yvonis animum," says BARONIUS, ad 1095, c. 16. The date of Yves's deliverance, and the length of his imprisonment, are not positively known.

[2] "Phillippo Dei Gratia, &c. . . . sic se regere ut Regi regum valeat complacere. . . . Poscens igitur majestati vestræ . . . ne . . . quod nunc dico in aure, cogar in vestris et multorum auribus publicare."—*Ep.* 28.

[3] "Faciat ergo Dominus rex adversus parvitatem meam, quantum Deo

The efforts of Yves of Chartres to renew the courage of his brethren were useless: "I have transmitted to them," he wrote to the Pope, "your letters; but they are silent, like dogs that dare not bark." [1]

The bishop who thus expressed himself was, however, far from being an enemy to the royal authority; he professed, on the contrary, with regard to the lay power, opinions more favourable than those of most of the eminent churchmen of his time, as we shall see further on; but he would not traffic with evil. He was, besides, profoundly versed in the secrets of that government of souls, which he so justly called "the art of arts, and the heaviest of burdens." Far from being absorbed by discussions of the king's marriage, he was at the same time carrying on the refutation of the errors of Roscelin[2] as to the Holy Trinity, and he addressed to the sophist the advice by which philosophers of all ages might profit, "*Not to seek to know more than it was fitting to know.*" [3] He asked the prayers of the monks safe in harbour that he might have the strength necessary to navigate among the storms.[4] He envied their calm.

permittente, libuerit vel licuerit: includat, excludat, prescribat . . . decrevi pati pro lege Dei mei: nec ulla ratione cogente, volo ei consentaneus in culpa esse, qui nolo esse consors in pœna."—*Ep.* 35.

[1] "Adhuc tamen tacens, tanquam canes muti non valentes latrare."—*Ep.* 25.

[2] Roscelin having been already condemned at the Council of Soissons in 1092, had pretended that Yves and St. Anselm, then Abbot of Bec, thought as he did; he affirmed that he had retracted at Soissons only for fear of being torn to pieces by the people. He had afterwards written against Robert of Arbrissel, one of the holiest monks of the time. St. Anselm, who had just been made Archbishop of Canterbury, published about the same time his treatise on the "Incarnation" in order to refute the heresiarch.

[3] "Non plus sapere quam oportet sapere, sed sapere ad sobrietatem." —*Ep.* 7.

[4] "Nos enim publicorum negotiorum tumultibus occupati . . . internæ quietis suavitatem vix aliquando admittimus, raro etiam canonicum pensum determinatio horis solvere prævalemus. Vos igitur qui velut in portu navigatis, oportet ut nobis orationis manus qua longe potestis extendatis." —*Ep.* 19, to the Abbot of Fécamp, William de Ros.

"I fight daily with wild beasts," he wrote to the Pope; "my soul has no peace; my heart is broken for the miseries of the Church, which no one, or scarcely any one, strives to cure. I exercise authority over certain men, but without being of much use to them. This is why I am often tempted to lay down my office, and to return to my former quiet, where I might wait for Him, who would deliver me at once from the cowardice and the storms of my mind. My affection for you alone retains me here."[1]

This affection was at once noble and disinterested. The pious prelate had all possible right to employ this inscription for a letter addressed to the sovereign pontiff: "To Urban, Pope, I, Yves, his spiritual son, address the homage of a pure love, and not a servile submission."[2]

Soon, indeed, he ceased to be the only defender in France of the sacredness of marriage and of the prerogatives of the Church. For a long time past, while pointing out to the sovereign pontiff the intolerable abuses which he observed in the Church of France,[3] he had implored him to appoint a legate who would seek not his own interest but that of Christ.[4] Urban yielded to this prayer by conferring the mission on Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons, the very man whom Gregory VII. had chosen for legate and designated for his successor.[5]

[1] "Ad bestias quotidie pugnans . . . quia video me præesse, sed nulli fere prodesse . . . quietem ubi illum expectem qui salvum me faciat a pusillanimitate spiritus et tempestate."—(Ps. 54,) *Ep.* 25.

[2] "Urbano summo pontifici Ivo spiritualis ejus filius, non servilis timoris, sed castæ dilectionis obsequium."—*Ep.* 25.

[3] "Multa tolero, multa dissimulo . . . multa enim inordinata video in domo Dei, quæ me torquent, maxime quod apud nos, qui altari non serviunt, de altari vivunt," &c.—*Ep.* 12.

[4] "Qui non sua quærat, sed Jesu Christi. Necessarius enim esset Ecclesiæ Dei in qua quilibet, quodlibet audet, et quod audet facet, et quod facit impunitum transit."—*Ibid.*

[5] He had been prior of St. Marcel-lès-Châlons, and as at this epoch there is no instance of an abbey or priory confided to other than monks, Mabillon (Ann., i. 70, No. 85) has concluded that he was a monk. But this opinion has been contested. See *Hist. littér. de France*, vol. ix. p. 303.

For a moment led away, Hugh had returned to the right path after the death of Victor III., and hastened to acknowledge Urban. At first he wished to decline the burden of the legation, but Yves begged him not to do so: "Do not," he wrote to him, "be one of those bad physicians who prefer their own quiet to the health of their patients. There is a new Ahab in Italy, and a new Jezebel in France: it is your part to be the new Elijah. Herodias is there dancing before Herod, and demanding of him the head of John the Baptist: John the Baptist ought none the less to say to him, '*Non licet;* it is not lawful for thee to leave thy wife and take thy neighbour's.'"[1]

Hugh at last yielded; and was scarcely invested with the character of legate when he convoked at Autun[2] a council of thirty-two bishops and many abbots, where the sentences already pronounced against the Emperor Henry[3] and the King of France were renewed. Thus excommunicated, Philip appealed to the Pope, threatening to withdraw from his obedience if he were not absolved. Hugh cited him to appear at the Council of Placentia, and afterwards gave him a reprieve until the Feast of All-Saints of the year 1095, in spite of the urgency of Yves of Chartres, whose only hope was in the energy of the sovereign pontiff and the legate.[4]

At this crisis Urban himself came into France, where, having celebrated the Feast of the Assumption at Notre Dame du Puy, he consecrated the Church of Chaise-Dieu, the great Monastery of Auvergne, which, under the rule of Abbot Seguin, had reached the highest point of splendour and regularity. Thence the pope went to his own monastery of Cluny, the abbot of which, the great Hugh, was still living, after forty-six years of office. Hugh had the happiness of receiving his old disciple, now become head of the

[1] *Ep.* 24.

[2] October 16, 1094.

[3] This was done because most of the bishops at the council belonged to the kingdom of Burgundy or Arles, then united to the Holy Roman Empire. Even Lyon depended on the emperor, as well as on the King of France.

[4] "Ubi restat adhuc anchora aliqua spei nostræ."—*Ep.* 30.

Church, after having been Prior of Cluny. Urban was the first pope who ever visited this celebrated monastery, which was specially devoted by its founders to the defence of the papacy. The pontiff confirmed all the immunities of the illustrious house. He offered himself to consecrate the high-altar of the immense church which St. Hugh was building, and in the discourse which he delivered to the people on this occasion, he declared that the desire to visit Cluny had been the first and principal cause of his journey into France.[1] Urban next returned to Auvergne, where he was to hold the famous Council of Clermont,[2] at which there were present 13 archbishops[3] with their suffragans, 225 bishops, and 90 abbots,—forming an assembly of about 400 prelates, or mitred abbots, without counting a numerous crowd of doctors and professors.[4] They adopted a good many important measures, intended to keep the Church pure from all contagion of evil, and free from all secular power.[5] At the same time, the council confirmed, as a general institution, the Truce of God, which had been already a long time in use in different provinces of the kingdom.[6] After having

[1] *Biblioth. Cluniac.*, p. 508. He afterwards drew a line round the abbey and its principal dependencies, under the name of *sacer bannus*, or sacred banlieu, within which it was forbidden, under pain of sacrilege, to commit any rapine or violence whatever.

[2] November 18, 1095.

[3] Those of Lyons, Pisa, Reggio, Bordeaux, Rheims, Bourges, Tours, Sens, Narbonne, Vienne, Tarragona, Aix, and Toledo. Besides these two last archbishops, there were several Spanish bishops.

[4] MABILL., i. 69, c. 22. "Illic præter episcoporum et abbatum examina, quos circiter 400 per præeminentes ferulas fuisse aliqui numerant, totius Franciæ et appendicium comitatuum litteratura conflixit."—GUIB. NOVIG., *Gest. Dei per Franc.*, ii. 2.

[5] ORDER. VIT., b. ix. p. 719; COLETTI, ix., 897.

[6] The origin of this institution is traced back to 1034; it was recognised in Normandy in 1046 (see Leprevost, *note* in ORD. VIT., vol. v. p. 316), and several times confirmed by the councils held by the popes in Apulia. According to the first canon of the Council of Clermont, the Truce of God required that, in private or legitimate wars, monks, clergy, and women should be unharmed, and that hostilities (*pacis fractio*) could only be carried on from the Monday to the Wednesday of each week, the other

renewed the ordinary prohibitions relative to simony, the marriage of priests, and investitures, the Pope, by new canons, forbade the bishops and priests to take the oath of liege homage between the hands of kings or other lay persons.[1] He forbade laymen to retain the tithes or other revenues of the Church, or to usurp the property of bishops or clergy after their deaths. He renewed the direction for abstinence in Lent; he ordered that any one who took refuge at the foot of a wayside cross, should find sanctuary there as if in a church, and should not be delivered to justice until assured of safety to life and limb. He recognised the primacy of the Church of Lyons, long disputed by those of Sens and Rouen.[2] Finally, the delay allowed to Philip of France having expired without his dismissing Bertrade, the Pope, in full council, pronounced sentence of excommunication against him, in spite of the solicitations and offers of all kinds made by the nobles of the court, where were assembled at this moment the king's principal accomplices, the Archbishops of Sens and Rheims, and many other great personages of the French kingdom.[3] Philip, to the scandal of an open adultery, added flagrant and inveterate habits of simony,[4] which are mentioned with reprobation by several

four days being reserved for the peace of God. A valuable regulation for the application of this canon to Touraine and Anjou, confirmed by the pope at Clermont, may be seen, ap. COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 933.

[1] "Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligium fidelitatem faciat."—CAN., 17.

[2] We will give later the decisions made on the subject of different monastic establishments.

[3] "Regem . . . tanta auctoritate excommunicavit, ut intercessiones spectabilium personarum, et multiplicium munerum illationes contempserit, et quod intra regni ipsius demorabatur limites non extimuerit."—GUIB. NOV., *loc. cit.*

[4] "Hominem in Dei rebus venalissimum."—GUIB. NOV. He was paid in his own coin by the Bishop of Chartres, predecessor of Yves, who had promised him the first prebend that should be vacant in his chapter. When the king reproached him for having given away several after this promise, the bishop answered: "I have not given away one; I have sold them all." —MICHEL SCOT, b. iv., *mensa philos.*, c. 28, ap. PAGI, *Crit.*, ann. 1095.

deeds drawn up at this time.[1] Yves of Chartres, present at the council, finally triumphed; and this first victory did but increase the zeal which he displayed during all the rest of his life, in defence of the purity of marriage in all ranks of society, the equal duty of both sexes to observe their vows, conjugal fidelity, and, finally, the right of the woman to dispose of herself freely in marriage, in spite of contrary stipulations on the part of her parents.[2] It is true that in thus acting Yves only followed the immemorial tradition of the fathers, and trod the path whence truly Catholic popes and bishops have never deviated.

Throughout the middle ages the life of these fathers of the Christian people was a constant struggle in favour of the indissolubility of the conjugal tie against the power of kings and nobles. The latter did not, indeed, yet possess the many opportunities of satisfying their sensual passions in secret offered to their successors by the life of courts and the relaxed morals of modern society; but through all ages, and in the most varying circumstances, the Roman Church has won for herself a glorious and eternal renown by protecting weakness in its holiest and most fragile form—the liberty and purity of woman. From St. John the Baptist to Clement de Droste, the last Archbishop of Cologne, it has been almost always on the question of marriage that the spiritual power has suffered from the sword and fetters of persecutors.

In this one year 1095, the two most powerful sovereigns of Christendom—the Emperor and the King of France—had been excommunicated by the Pope for having violated the law of marriage.[3] From age to age the same example

[1] "Facta est hæc donatio anno ab Incarnat, &c. . . . Urbano apostolico, Francia ex adulterio Philippi indigni regis fœdat. . . ." It must be said that this donation was made by Count Fulk, Bertrade's outraged husband.—PAGI.

[2] See the collection of his letters, *passim*, especially Ep. 134 and Ep. 166.

[3] Fleury remarks repeatedly (b. 64, n. 21 and 29) that the excommunication of Philip did not lead to his deposition, and that no one ceased to

was followed until the sixteenth century, when a pope chose rather to see the whole kingdom of England break with the Holy See than to sell the right of divorce to a voluptuous tyrant. Let no one be astonished, then, that even amidst the religious degradation of our century piety has survived among women: they do but pay the debt of their mothers.

obey him. Nothing was more natural; the penal consequences of excommunication only followed, if the excommunicated person allowed a year and a day to pass without seeking absolution. Philip took care never to let this legal delay pass without making some show of submission, or without obtaining a new prolongation, until his definitive absolution in 1106. There was never, accordingly, any need for the Pope to depose him, or for his subjects to disobey him; unlike the case of the Emperor Henry, who, after having obtained his absolution a first time, again revolted against even the jurisdiction of the Pope, and was deposed by him and by the assembly of princes. The president, Hénault, does not seem so well satisfied as the Abbé Fleury with the consequences of the sentence passed upon Philip. He says of this king that "*he was less degraded in the eyes of his people by his vices than by his weakness in allowing himself to be punished for them.*" A fine doctrine, certainly, and one well worthy of a Parliamentary dignitary writing under the reign of Madame de Pompadour!

CHAPTER III

URBAN II., PETER THE HERMIT, AND THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE CRUSADE

The first pilgrims in the Holy Land.—St. Simon and Sigebert of Mayence at Jerusalem.—Calamities endured by the Christians in Palestine.—The Crusades were not a cause of weakness to the Church.—The *sweet thirst* for holy pilgrimage, for the journey of God.—Urban II. the true promoter of the First Crusade.—Pious foundations of the Crusaders before their departure for the Holy Land.

THAT which in the eyes of posterity gives their chief glory to the Council of Clermont and to Urban II., is the preaching of the First Crusade. This great enterprise had been for a long time preluded, so to speak, by the frequent pilgrimages of Western Christians to the Holy Sepulchre. Catholics of all ages and ranks went thither in crowds from all countries, and through a thousand dangers;[1] princes and subjects alike, with staff in hand and scrip on shoulder.[2] Monks had always been remarked in the first rank of these

[1] "Robertus, comes Flandrensis, cum baculo et pera . . ." from 1085 to 1089.—*MS. Rob. Monach.*, quoted by Ducange, *not. in lib. vii. Alexiadis;* the Vicomte de Limoges, Comte d'Angoulême, Robert of Normandy, the Comte de Luxemburg.

[2] There had already been several pilgrimages in the preceding centuries. See above the deed of election of an abbot in place of the one of St. Albin, who was going to the Holy Land. The explanation, No. 11, at the end of volume i. of Michaud's *History of the Crusades*, contains a very complete list of the pilgrimages previous to the Crusades; but the most exact work on this curious subject is the *Chronological List of Pilgrimages anterior to the Crusades from the Thirteenth Century*, drawn up with much care by M. Ludovic Lalanne, and inserted in the *Biblioth. de l'École de Chartres*, vol. ii. p. 1, 2nd series.

pilgrims. Almost all the eminent abbots of the twelfth century,[1] as well as a crowd of monks, had made the voyage to the Holy Land. A great number of nobles and knights thus abandoned their homes, and, touched by compunction, after praying at the tomb of Christ, returned to end their lives piously in some monastery. Towards the end of the tenth century, Bononius established himself first in Egypt, and afterwards at Jerusalem. He reformed, according to the rule of St. Benedict, the monasteries which still subsisted in the countries conquered by the Mussulmans, and was able to bring back to Constantinople a number of Greek captives, who owed their ransom to his devotion.[2] The great abbot, Richard of St. Vannes, started at the head of 700 pilgrims collected together by Duke Richard of Normandy, and whose expenses that prince undertook to defray. The monk St. Simeon, who was born of a Greek family of Syracuse, and who died a recluse at Trèves, carried away, says his biographer, by the invincible desire which drew Christians to Jerusalem, had, in his earliest youth, renounced all else to hasten thither, and had passed seven years in Syria acting as guide to European pilgrims.[3] The monk Sigebert, Archbishop of Mayence, went thither, accompanied by 7000 companions.[4] It was on his return from the Holy Land that Liébert, Bishop of Cambrai, had founded the Abbey of St. Sepulchre, in memory of his pilgrimage. The holy monk Udalric, the compiler of the Customs of Cluny, almost perished under the swords of the Saracens when he went to thank God for the grace of baptism on the banks

[1] *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. viii. p. 238, ad ann. 1025.

[2] *Act. SS. Julii*, vol. ii. p. 545.

[3] In 1064.

[4] "Videns quosque et nos his partibus desiderio infatigabili currere ad sepulcrum Domini . . . per septem annos ductor peregrinorum fuit."—*Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. viii. p. 329, ad ann. 1035. St. Simeon spoke five languages—Egyptian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin.—*Ibid.*, p. 331. It is surprising that M. L. Lalanne has not availed himself for his work of the curious *Life of St. Simeon*, which contains a quantity of interesting details on the relations of Christians with the Holy Land before the Crusades.

of the Jordan.[1] Thierry, the first abbot of the restored St. Evroul, finding himself attacked by a mortal illness at St. Nicholas in Cyprus, entered a church, laid his head upon the altar-step, and joining his hands crosswise, thus fell asleep in death.[2]

It was not only isolated and wandering monks who endeavoured to practise the virtues of the sons of St. Benedict near the tomb of Christ, polluted by the presence of conquering Mussulmans; the enterprise was shared by whole communities. There were, in the eleventh century, two monasteries at Mount Sinai and one at Bethlehem, sustained by gifts collected in the West, even in the depths of Normandy,[3] by the generous intervention of merchants of Amalfi. The Abbey of Santa Maria Latina, founded by these merchants at Jerusalem,[4] and peopled by monks from Monte Cassino, introduced the rites of the Latin Church into the Holy Land.[5] A convent, under the invocation of St. Mary Magdalen, was added. These communities, as may well be supposed, could not, like thosein Europe, receive gifts of land; but the pious generosity of the people of Amalfi partly provided for their needs; each year burghers and merchants collected among themselves a sum, which, being transmitted to Jerusalem, relieved the penury not only of the monks and nuns, but also of the Western pilgrims.[6] It may be ima-

[1] *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix. p. 780. He had desired martyrdom; but human weakness getting the better of him, says his biographer, and seeing the Saracens appear as he was coming out of the river, he ran away without stopping to dress himself.

[2] "Super dextrum latus recubans, quasi dormire volens, caput suum super marmoreum gradum reclinavit, manusque super pectus in modum crucis aptavit."—ORD. VIT., b. iii. p. 66, ed. Leprévost. Raoul, Abbot of Mont St. Michel, who accompanied Thierry, died like him, in pilgrimage, in 1058.

[3] *Vit. S. Simeonis*, Nos. 4, 5, and 8, in *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. viii. p. 330.

[4] In 1048.

[5] "Ut secundum latinitatis usum divinæ majestatis servitium persolverent."—ORD. VIT., b. x.

[6] "Neque reditus erant neque possessiones; sed prædicti Amalfitani annis singulis, tam qui domi erant, tam qui negotiationes sequebantur,

gined how the narratives of these pilgrims, on their return home, must have swelled the hearts of their countrymen. But it was reserved for an obscure monk, Peter the Hermit,[1] to determine the movement which was to fling the Catholic West upon the infidel East. Having brought back from Jerusalem and the holy places the most bitter recollections of the odious rule which pagans exercised over unhappy Christians, the monk Peter, who, in celestial visions, seemed perpetually to hear the supplications of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the earnest appeals of the sovereign pontiff, undertook to travel throughout Europe, calling Catholics to the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre and of their persecuted brethren in the East.

After long wanderings through various countries, where the people listened with eagerness to his words, the hermit-preacher came to Urban II. at the Council of Clermont, and the Pope's powerful voice was joined to his.[2] The monk-pontiff, full of faith in the prophetic hopes of two of his predecessors—the monks Sylvester II. and Gregory VII.—who had been the first to appeal to Christendom to deliver the Holy Land from the yoke of Islam, renewed, at the Council of Constance, an attempt he had already made at Placentia. Addressing himself specially to the nobles, who had assembled in great numbers, he drew a powerful picture of the cruelties and sacrileges committed by the Saracens in Palestine, and exhorted them to go and expiate, by a lawful and sacred war, their own violence, rapine, and indomitable pride.[3]

collecta inter se quasi per symbolum pecunia, per eos qui Hierosolymam proficiscebantur . . . advenientibus christicolis aliqua misericordia."—GUILL. TYR., b. xviii. c. 5.

[1] Mabillon has proved that he was a monk and a Frenchman.—*Ann. Bened.*, vol. v. b. 68, No. 86. See GUIB. NOVIG., ii. 4.

[2] "Per manum Petri, viri venerabilis, qui præsens est. . . ." Speech of the Pope to the council.—GUILL. TYR., *De Bello sacro*, i. 15.

[3] "Vos accincti cingulo militiæ magno supercilio fratres vestros dilaniatis. . . . Si vultis animabus vestris consuli, istius modi militiæ cingulum quantocius deponite, et ad defendendam orientalem Ecclesiam velocius

"Go," said the venerable pontiff, "and die for Christ, in that very place where Christ died for you."[1]

Urban, in order to call down the blessing of Heaven on the expedition which he destined to conquer the tomb of Christ, commanded the clergy to recite, every Saturday, the office of the Blessed Virgin.[2] Nothing could cool the zeal of the Pope nor destroy his energy—neither the perils which surrounded the Church in the West, nor the implacable struggle which, for twenty years, had been carried on between him and the emperor, and which had never suffered him, since his accession to the pontificate, to occupy in peace the throne of St. Peter and the city of Rome.

With the self-abnegation of a true monk, and the generosity of a great pope, Urban sacrificed everything to the realisation of his plan. His thoughts were concentrated on the East, whither flowed, at his bidding, the most valiant soldiers of Christendom. Himself for seven years a wanderer and an exile, the pontiff employed all his authority and all his influence to re-establish internal peace, that he might be free to send the most fervent champions of the Church upon this distant service.[3]

concurrite."—WILLELM. MALMESB., *De reg. Angl.*, l. iv. c. 2. Three different speeches, or three different versions of the same speech of Urban in council, are given by William of Tyre, William of Malmesbury, and Guibert de Nogent.

[1] "Pulchrum sit vobis in illa civitate mori pro Christo in qua pro vobis Christus mortuus est."—WILH. MALM., *loc. cit.*

[2] BARON., ad ann. 1095, c. 51.

[3] This disinterestedness appears so incredible to the Protestant Lüden, that he tries to persuade us that Urban yielded to force in preaching the Crusade, and that his speeches at Clermont only express an artificial enthusiasm.—*Erkünstelter Begeisterung*, vol. ix. pp. 264–277. It is thus that since the Reformation and the Renaissance, the annals of our fathers have been interpreted, in contempt of the most striking facts, such as the two great councils of Placentia and Clermont, in contempt of the most incontestable assertions, and the unanimous testimony of contemporaries. Thus we see a school of historians labouring to transform into acts of baseness and hypocrisy the great deeds of those whose faith they have always ignored or denied, and whose mind and genius, consequently, they could not understand. Judging others by themselves, and feeling themselves

In reality this unheard of transplantation of the living strength of the Church was no cause of weakness to her; on the contrary, it only gave her authority deeper root. Nevertheless, as the guarantee of so great a result, the Pope had nothing but his absolute faith in the promises of Christ.[1] Nothing is more admirable than his unconquerable resolution, unless it be the marvellous eagerness with which the Catholic world responded. We know how the shout of "God wills it!" which had answered Urban's words at Clermont, resounded from one end of Christendom to the other; and how all at once there seemed to breathe upon Europe a rushing wind, which extinguished all discord, and filled the souls of men with a spirit from on high which none could resist.[2]

We know how not only princes and knights, but also peasants and serfs, rose in crowds to attack the infidel;[3] how rich and poor, men and women, old and young, sold all they had to seek the *way of God;*[4] how the mockers of to-day, caught by the contagion of example, became the

utterly incapable of any devotion whatever to a cause in a manner superhuman, they find it easier and more simple to explain, by the vilest motives, the greatest of our ancestors, which is supernatural for them, and they choose such personages alone out of history for apology or panegyric as will never put them to the embarrassment of explaining the motives of their magnanimity.

[1] "Sic Urbano agente, refloruit orbis: nam pacem renovans, Ecclesiæ jura sua restituit, et paganos de terris christianorum expelli fecit. Et quoniam res Dei curavit, effecit vicissim Deus, ut omnes ultro ei se subjicerent."—FULCHER, CARNOT., *Hist. Hierosol.*, i. 1.

[2] Guibert de Nogent, *Gest Dei*, ii. 3, uses an analogous though different image: "Et sicuti rapidissimi venti impetus solet non magna pluviæ unda restringi, ita illico contigit ad invicem simultates universorum et bella sopiri, per inditam sibi aspirationem, haud dubium quin Christi."—GUIB. NOVIG., *loc. cit.*

[3] "Jam Palatinorum comitum pruriebat intentio: et mediocritas equestrium virorum parturire jam cœperat: cum ecce, pauperum animositas tantis ad hoc ipsum desideriis aspiravit, ut eorum nemo de censuum parvitate tractaret, de domorum, vinearum et agrorum congruenti distractione curaret," &c.—*Ibid.*

[4] "Quisque . . . de proponenda *via Dei* . . . quosque sollicitat."—*Ibid.*

enthusiasts of to-morrow;[1] how even the poorest labourers, watching for the passing by of some lord whose troop they might join,[2] started in waggons drawn by oxen, carrying with them not only their most precious possessions, but even little children, who, whenever a town or castle came in sight, innocently asked if this were not Jerusalem.[3] From Galicia to Denmark whole nations were seen to rouse themselves and rush eastward.[4]

"Oh, what good seed," said contemporaries, "is the word of the great Shepherd! How admirable are the fruit and flowers which it produces![5] Inestimable and marvellous is the grace of Providence, which, by the love of Christ, and under His sovereignty alone, can all at once collect into one body so many scattered members of Christ,[6] so many nations

[1] "Dum hodie super omnimoda aliorum venditione cachinnant . . . in crastinum repentino instinctu pro paucis nummulis sua tota tradentes, cum eis proficiscebantur quos riserant."—GUIB. NOVIG., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Catervatim concurrebant populi, ubicumque unum de principibus iturum se novissime audierant, ut se illius comitatui sociarent."—GUILL. TYR. c. 23.

[3] "Bobus viroto applicatis . . . substantiolas cum parvulis in carruca convehere; et ipsos infantulos, dum obviam habent quælibet castella vel urbes, si hæc esset Jerusalem, ad quam tenderent rogitare."—GUIB. NOV., *loc. cit.*

[4] "Gallicos extremos hominum."—ODER. VIT., b. ix. p. 725. The brother of the King of Denmark came with two bishops of his own country, where the faith has just been established.

[5] "O fidei semen, bona germina quot modo præbes,
Cum rutili flores refluunt pastoris ab ore,
Et pariunt fructus Domini dignanter in usus! . . .
Sexus uterque Deo gliscit parere sereno;
Certatim currunt Christi purgare sepulcrum."
—DOMNIZO, b. ii. c. 10.

[6] "Eo tempore quo omnis terra festinabat venire in Jerusalem . . . fuit quædam triremis magna et fortis quæ plena hominibus armatis, volucri cursu tendebat properare in Hierusalem ut Christiano exercitui auxilium ferret. . . . Erant autem in ipsa maxima navi, homines diversarum nationum, Francorum scilicet, Burgundionum, Aquitanorum, Wasconum, Hispanorum, Italicorum, Siculorum, Calabridum, sed et aliarum nationum. . . ." A storm comes on; the men of each country invoke their national saint—the French, St. Denis; the Poitevins, St.

differing each from the other in language and in fatherland![1] Never did war furnish to sages, to poets, or to historians, a more glorious subject than these exploits of the soldiers of God. With this handful of Christians drawn from their homes by the SWEET THIRST[2] of pilgrimage, the Church triumphs over all the pagans of the East. The God of Abraham goes with them and renews His ancient miracles: He attracts the faithful of the West by an ardent desire to see the sepulchre of the Messiah: He guides them solely by the voice of Pope Urban, without the intervention of any king, or of any secular power: He draws them from all corners of the earth, as heretofore the Hebrews from the land of Egypt: He conducts them through strange lands even to Palestine, and by them He gloriously overcomes cities, peoples, and kings."[3]

Thus the true promoter of the Crusade was Pope Urban.[4] Peter the Hermit was, in fact, only the pontiff's enthusiastic auxiliary, and it appears from all contemporary accounts that the ardent preacher did not know how to rule, restrain, or direct the multitude which he had assembled, and with

Hilaire; the Tourangeaux, St. Martin; the Orleanais, St. Aignan; the Limousins, St. Martial; the Toulousains, St. Saturnin; the Auxerrois, St. Germain; the Vermandois, St. Quentin, &c. But the storm only ceased when a man of Ponthieu had persuaded them to join in invoking St. Riquier, founder and first abbot of the great abbey of that name. See above, b. i. c. 3. VARIULPH., *De Mirac. S. Richar.*, c. 3 in *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. vii., ad ann. 981.

[1] "Mira et inestimabili divinitatis dispensatione tot X^ti membra linguis, tribubus et nationibus differentia, subito in unum X^ti caritate coaluere corpus, uno omnes Christo rege, singulis singulæ gentes ducibus procurate."—*Ann. Saxon.*, ad ann. 1096, p. 581.

[2] DULCI DESIDERIO.

[3] "Nulla, ut reor, unquam sophistis in bellicis rebus gloriosior materia prodiit, quam nostris nunc Dominus poetis atque librariis tradidit, dum per paucos christicolas, &c. . . . Antiqua nempe miracula Deus Abraham nuper iteravit, dum solo ardore visendi sepulchrum Messiæ fideles occiduos illexit, et sine rege sæcularique exactione per Urbanum papam commonuit," &c.—ORDER. VIT., b. ix. p. 718.

[4] This is testified by all historians of the First Crusade without exception.

which he first started for the Holy Land. There were but eight knights in this disorderly and impatient crowd,[1] who branded with the mark of human corruption a work divinely inspired, by massacring the German Jews and ravaging Hungary, before they went on to perish in Bulgaria and the plains of Bithynia, under the swords of the infidels. The nobles, who had chiefly felt the impulse given by Urban, showed at once more religious feeling and more prudence in the arrangements which they made before quitting their native land.

"At the moment of starting, in obedience to the signal given by the Roman pontiff," said Stephen, Count of Blois, son-in-law of William the Conqueror, in a deed given to the abbey of Marmoutier, "I grant to the monastery the forest of Lôme, for the good of the soul of my father Thibalt, whom I fear that I often offended during his lifetime—a fault I have many times lamented, together with my wife, my friends, and my servants."[2]

Raymond, Count of Toulouse, the most powerful prince who engaged in the First Crusade, declared that he took the cross for love of St. Gilles, whose monastery he had injured.[3] While still young, before he became Count of Toulouse, he had gone to the tomb of the holy abbot Robert of Chaise-Dieu, and kneeling and taking up his sword, which had been laid upon the altar, he had promised that, if the Lord should bestow the county upon him, he would hold it only of God and St. Robert. Now, starting for the Crusade, and desirous of remaining faithful to the oath of his youth, Raymond chose to carry with him, as a relic, the wooden

[1] "Indisciplinatum vulgus, utpote mancipia et publica servitia."—GUIB. NOV., ii. 4.

[2] "Jussu papæ romani, Urbani scilicet secundi . . . timens ego cum patrem minus honorando vel minus ei parendo, meipsum quoad vixerat offendisse, cum sæpius inde conquerer et præfata conjuge et amicis et familiaribus meis plerumque inde loquerer."—MAB., *Ann.*, vol. v. App., No. 40.

[3] CATEL., *Hist. des comtes de Toul.*, p. 131.

cup and staff of the venerable abbot, and took also a monk of Chaise-Dieu, whom he named Bishop of Tripoli, in Palestine.[1] Godfrey of Bouillon, the illustrious chief of the Crusaders,[2] went, before starting, to the abbey of Afflighem, to visit a knight named Godfrey the Black, who had been his friend in the world, and who was now fighting the devil under the Benedictine cowl. The prince gave five estates to the house,[3] and took away with him a certain number of pious monks, who, throughout the expedition, celebrated the divine service day and night.[4] When the conquest of the holy places was achieved, Godfrey built, for these companions of his pilgrimage, an abbey in the valley of Jehoshaphat: and he founded several others—one at Bethany, in honour of St. Lazarus; another at Jerusalem, under the invocation of St. Mary; finally, a convent under the name of St. Anne, near the place which was believed to be that of the birth of the Blessed Virgin.[5]

All these foundations were placed under the rule of St. Benedict, and they shed, through the new kingdom, the

[1] MARBOD., Ep. Redon. *Vit. S. Robert*, lib. tripartitus dist., ii. c. 10.

[2] No author has explained the strange transformation undergone by Godfrey, who, from being the champion of the Imperial cause against Rodolph of Suabia, whom, it is said, he killed with his own hand, became the leader of an enterprise entirely conceived and directed by the papacy. It may be permitted to us to believe that the horrible revelations of the emperor's conduct towards his wife produced a great effect upon the hero, and separated him at last from a party utterly unworthy of him who was to be the first king of the Holy Land, the elected head of the most truly Christian kingdom on earth.

[3] *Hist. Afflighem.*, c. 17, in *Spicileg.*, vol. ii. See above for the origin of this house.

[4] "Bene disciplinatos monachos . . . qui toto itinere, horis diurnis et nocturnis, ecclesiastico more, divina ibi ministrabant officia."—GUILL. TYR., b. ix. c. 9. It is not easy to reconcile the presence of these monks and many others, during the expedition (see the *Chron. de Mirac., S. Richarii*, quoted, note 3, p. 153), with the prohibition by Urban, proved to us by Geoffrey de Vendôme in his letter to the Abbot of Marmoutier, to persuade him not to leave his monastery and go to Jerusalem.

[5] "Quia per illa tempora mulieres ad sacra loca passim confluebant."—MABILL., *Ann.*

perfume of sanctity which had already embalmed the West.[1] The Norman Crusaders, under Bohemond, naturally claimed for themselves the protection of the ancient abbey of St. Maria Latina, which their neighbours of Amalfi had founded in the evil days of the past. A hospital for pilgrims had been joined to it in honour of St. John, and it was the lay brothers of this Benedictine hospital who, a few years later, founded the famous Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which for five centuries was the bulwark of Europe and the terror of infidels.[2] As many monks had visited the Holy Sepulchre before the Crusaders, and as the hermit and the pope who preached the Crusade were both monks, and aided by a great number of their brethren, it was but just that their names should be honourably inscribed in the history of that holy and wonderful enterprise of which, indeed, many of them became the recorders.[3] We should not forget that to one of these monastic annalists is due the honour of having designated the expedition to the Holy Land by the grandest title which has ever been given to any work wrought by the hand of man—

GESTA DEI PER FRANCOS![4]

[1] "Tanquam cella aromatica."—JACOB. VITR., *Hist. occid.*, c. 38. The native monks ended by adopting the Latin ritual, and submitting themselves to Cluny.—PETR. VENER., b. ii. ep. 44.

[2] These lay brothers, or Hospitallers, afterwards freed themselves from the Benedictine rule, and adopted that of St. Augustine, but preserved the black frock and white cross of their order. The regular name of the Order of St. John (afterwards called of Rhodes and of Malta) was *Brothers of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem.*

[3] Ordericus Vitalis, William of Malmesbury, Odo of Deuil.

[4] GUIBERT DE NOGENT. The Protestant Bongars has since used it for his collection of the *Historians of the Crusades.*

CHAPTER IV

THE PAPACY AND THE FIRST CRUSADE

Urban II. preaches the Crusade in Limousin, Touraine, Poitou, and Anjou. —He arbitrates between Yves of Chartres and Geoffrey of Vendôme. —He visits Marmoutier and presides at the Council of Tours.—He returns to Rome, where he is visited by many chiefs of the Crusaders. —Henry IV. takes no part in the Crusade.

THE double interest of the Crusade and of the Monastic Orders seems to have occupied Urban II. incessantly during his stay in France after the Council of Clermont. In spite of the great number of bishops drawn from monasteries,[1] or who, like Hugh of Grenoble, sought at Chaise-Dieu [2] an asylum from the cruel burden of the episcopate,[3] there continually arose distressing conflicts between bishops and abbots. Yves of Chartres, so zealous for the maintenance of exact discipline, and united by many ties to a great number of monks, complained bitterly of the encroaching spirit of certain monasteries, and of the inroads which they made upon episcopal authority.[4] With the object of

[1] Thus, about this period, Fulk of Bec became Bishop of Beauvais; Gervin, Abbot of St. Riquier, Bishop of Amiens; Serlon, Abbot of St. Evroul, Bishop of Séez, &c.

[2] He had only been able to remain there a year; Gregory VII. had forced him to return to his diocese. He was the son of a gentleman of the Valentinois, who, being an octogenarian, became a Carthusian, and died after eighteen years of a religious life in the arms of his son.

[3] This was done also by Robert, Bishop of Langres, and by Hilgold and Henry, both Bishops of Soissons, one after the other.

[4] "Infinita monachorum cupiditas infinitam facit manere discordiam." —Ep. 216. "Monachi, invidia demoniaca moti, voluerunt in alienam messem falcem immittere et mihi episcopalia jura privare."—Ep. 226. See also his Epistles 36 and 65. It was chiefly the monasteries situated in episcopal cities which caused these discords.

remedying this state of things, a council had forbidden any abbot promoted to the episcopate to retain his abbey;[1] it had also secured to bishops the right of providing for the government of parishes dependent upon abbeys,[2] and at the same time condemned as an act of simony the exaction called *ransom of the altars*, which the bishops claimed out of the proceeds of oblations yielded to the monks by laymen.[3] One of the most powerful abbeys in France at that time was Marmoutier, which was subject to Cluny, but rivalled its adopted mother in influence and in regularity, and laboured like her to reform other monasteries. Finding its liberty threatened by Archbishop Raoul of Tours, the great enemy of monks, formerly excommunicated by the papal legate, Marmoutier carried its cause to the council, where the Pope pronounced in its favour. When the archbishop's partisans murmured and disputed the sovereign pontiff's right thus to exempt completely from episcopal jurisdiction, Urban rose, commanded silence, and declared that, in virtue of his apostolic authority, and the decrees of his predecessors, it was lawful for him either to unite two bishoprics in one, or to divide one into two, or to receive into the patronage of the Roman Church any establishment he chose, no one having a right to oppose him. And, having said this, he declared the privileges of Marmoutier to be irrevocable.[4]

[1] "Ne quis episcopus simul et abbas esset."—ORD., ix. 719. On account of the bad conduct of Gervin, Bishop of Amiens, towards his Abbey of St. Riquier, which was taken from him.

[2] Bishops, however, were obliged to obtain the approval of the abbots for the choice of the curates whom they nominated.—CAN., iv. in add. COSSART., ap. COLETT., *Concil.*, xii. 913.

[3] "Redemptio altarium."—CAN., iv., *ibid.* We have not space to enter into the details of this affair. See FLEURY, b. 64, n. 29; COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 90; *Not. in Ep. Yvon. Carnot.*, p. 213, ed. Fronto. Thirty years later, the discussion of the matter was renewed between the Bishop of Angers and Geoffrey of Vendôme; but the latter, who had been present at the council, pronounced with the authority of an indisputable witness. —Ep. GOFF. VIND., b. iii., n. 12; MAB., *Ann.*, b. 75, n. 15.

[4] "Cum obstinati oblectarent . . . erectus in pedes pontifiex, imperato

The council rose at the end of November 1095, and the Pope travelled through Limousin, Touraine, Anjou, and Poitou, preaching the Crusade,[1] and himself distributing the cross to all whom he won for the sacred enterprise. At the same time he went to visit the principal monasteries,[2]

silentio ex apostolica auctoritate et pontificalibus decretis sibi competere dixit, ut ex uno episcopatu duos, et ex duobus unum faciat; abbatias cæterasque congregationes, ubi æquitas et ratio postularet, aut coadunare, aut disjungere: et quidquid in patrocinium S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ suscipere vellet, nullus suæ auctoritati repugnare posset: quibus præmissis, Majoris monasterii privilegium nodo indissolubili firmavit."—MABILL., *Ann. Ben.*, b. 69, c. 23.

[1] "Ubicumque fuit, præcepit cruces facere hominibus, et pergere Hierusalem, et liberare eam a Turcis et aliis gentibus."—*Chron. Malleac.*, ad ann. 1096. "Venit Andegavum et ammonuit gentem nostram, ut irent Jerusalem, expugnaturi Gentilem populum."—*MS. Fulcon. comit.*, quoted by PAGI, ad ann. 1096. He went from Angers to Sablé to persuade the lord of the latter town, Robert the Burgundian, to take the cross.—*Essai Historique sur l'Abbaye de Solesmes*, p. 22.

[2] We think it well here to trace the itinerary of Urban II. during his stay in France, from the dates of his deeds, and the accounts of contemporary writers. It is valuable for monastic history as well as for that of art. We will follow the authorities quoted by Mabillon in his Annals, and Pagi in his Criticisms on the Annals of Baronius, as we have done elsewhere in the work, supplementing them from the excellent chronological tables which Stentzel has given in the second volume of his *History of the Franconian Emperors*, and by various other references.

1095.—The precise date of his arrival in France is unknown.
? ? ? Valence.—Urban consecrates the cathedral.
August 15.—Notre-Dame-du-Puy. Urban celebrates the Assumption.
,, 18.—At Chaise-Dieu. Dedication of abbey church, and proclamation of the exemption.
Sept. 1 to 7.—At St. Gilles. Celebration of the Feast of St. Gilles. Privileges granted to Chaise-Dieu.
,, 11.—At Tarascon. Benediction of a field given by Countess Stephanie "the Gentle" to build a church upon.
,, 12.—At Avignon.—Deed given to the canons of the cathedral.
? Date uncertain.—At Macon.
Oct. 18 to 25.—At Cluny. Dedication of high altar.
? At Souvigny.—Stays eight days, and receives Archambaud de Bourbon penitent.
Nov. 18.—At Clermont. Opening of the Council.
Dec. 2.—Leaves Clermont.
,, 3.—At Soucilanges. Dedication of the abbey church.

dedicating cathedrals, abbatial and other churches, which were rising on all sides, consecrating altars, reforming abuses, reconciling excommunicated penitents, choosing from among monks such men as he thought able to do good

Dec. ?—At Brioude.
,, 7.—At St. Flour. Dedication of priory church. Deed for Marcigny and Soucilanges.
,, 21.—At Uzerches. Bishop Humbald prevents him from dedicating the abbey church.
,, 23.—At Limoges.—Deposition of Bishop Humbald.
,, 29.—At Limoges.—Dedication of the cathedral.
,, 31.—At Limoges.—Dedication of abbey church of St. Martial, founded by Louis le Debonnaire.
Jan. 2. 1096.—At Limoges. Privileges to the abbey of Tulle.
,, 10.—At Charroux. Dedication of grand altar in the abbey church.
,, 13.—At Poitiers. Celebration of St. Hilaire.
,, 21.—At Poitiers. Dedication of the abbey church of Moutierneuf. See the inscription published by M. de Chergé in the *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*, 1844, p. 186.
Feb. ?—At Loudun. Dedication of St. Croix and St. Nicholas, proved by a deed given at Tours, March 19.
,, 10.—At Angers. Dedication of abbey church of St. Nicholas.
,, 14.—At Sablé. Deed given to St. Nicholas d'Angers.
,, At Solesmes.
,, At Glanfeuil.
,, At Mans.
,, At Vendôme. Dedication of the altar of the Holy Trinity, and deed of exemption against the Bishop of Chartres.
March 2 to 9.—At Marmoutier, near Tours.
,, 9.—At Marmoutier. Preaches on the banks of the Loire.
,, 10.—At Marmoutier. Dedication of the abbey church.
,, 14.—At Tours. Council. Confirmation of privileges of St. Martin.
,, 23.—At Tours. Solemn procession of *Lætare* Sunday. Gift of the Golden Rose to Count Fulk of Anjou.
,, 29.—At Poitiers. New deed in favour of St. Martin.
,, ??—At St. Maixent. Deed for Glanfeuil.
,, ??—At St. Jean-d'Angely. Proved by letters from the Pope to the abbot.
April 7.—At St. Jean-d'Angely. Bull giving exemption to the abbey of Moutierneuf, at Poitiers—Mab., b. 69, No. 39; *MSS.* of D. Fonteneau, vol. xix. p. 85.
,, 13.—At Saintes. Feast of Easter. Duke William VII. of Aquitaine threatened with excommunication. Dedication of an altar in the crypt of St. Eutropius.

service to the Church in more elevated positions;[1] deposing, as at Limoges, prevaricating bishops; condemning the most powerful lords to penance and expiation, as in the cases of the Sire de Bourbon,[2] the Count of Anjou, and the

April 14.—At Saintes. Bull in favour of Moutierneuf against the canons of St. Hilaire. *MSS.* of Fonteneau, *loc. cit.*
May 1.—At Bordeaux. Dedication of St. Etienne.
,, ?—At Nérac. Dedication of St. Thomas and St. Nicholas.
,, 7.—At Leyrac. *Cella* of Cluny.
,, 13.—At Moissac. Letter to Hugh of Cluny.
,, 24.—At Toulouse. Dedication of St. Sernin.
June 29.—At Maguelonne. Benediction of the island.
? ? At Montpelier. Examination of the affair of the election to the see of Paris.
July 12.—At Nîmes. Council. Absolution of the king.
,, 16.—At St. Gilles. Deed for two Spanish monasteries.
,, 22.—At Avignon. Deed in favour of St. Gilles.
? ? At Cavaillon. Confirmation of the privileges of Montmajour.
Aug. 5.—At Apt.—Dedication of the church of St. Eusebius.

By placing in 1095 the deed of September 11, on the subject of the benediction of the Comtesse de Tarascon's field, as suits the heading, *anno Pontificatus octavo*, and as is done by Mabillon, who twice repeats it wrongly (b. 69, Nos. 21 and 41), we escape the contradiction noticed by Pagi between this date, which he places in 1096, and the express statement of Bernold of Constance, who says that the Pope celebrated the Exaltation of the Cross (September 14) at Mortara, near Pavia. It is certain that he was on the banks of the Rhine in September 1095; it is more natural then to fix his journey to Tarascon at that date. We have been able to find no exact authority for the date of his journey to Vienne, where he ordered the founding of a church for the relics of St. Antoine, which gave rise to the beautiful church of St. Antoine in Dauphiné, afterwards the head of an order. Fleury and Mabillon placed the Pope's journey in 1096.

[1] As Milo, a monk of St. Albin d'Angers, who afterwards became Cardinal-bishop of Palestrina, and legate in France in 1103. Going to Uzerches, Bernard, Archbishop of Toledo, who accompaied the Pope, took with him a distinguished monk, named Maurice Burdin; but the choice was not happy, for Maurice became afterwards anti-Pope.

[2] Urban obliged Archambault de Bourbon to repair the wrongs he had done at Souvigny; Fulk d'Anjou to release his brother whom he had kept in prison for thirty years; and William of Aquitaine to restore to the Abbey of Vendôme a church which he had usurped in the Isle of Oléron.

Duke of Aquitaine; exercising in all the great courts of the country [1] the function of supreme judge of the Church and of society. The historians of the time relate that the pontiff everywhere applied himself to confirm the privileges and exemptions granted by his predecessors to the regular clergy, without stopping to consider what in them might be contrary even to the authority of the papal legates. He placed these privileges under the guarantee of the most solemn acts of his pontificate.[2] Thus, for example, he assigned to the abbots of St. Martin the principal share in the right of election to the vacant see, and in the government of the diocese during the bishop's absence.[3]

Being called upon, at Vendôme, to pronounce upon the contradictory claims of two of the holiest and most eminent bishops of the Church—Yves of Chartres and Geoffrey of Vendôme—Urban did not hesitate to declare in favour of Abbot Geoffrey, whom he released from his promise of obedience to Yves, made at the time of his election, by declaring it null and void.[4] The Pope re-established in favour of Geoffrey, who had enthroned him in the Lateran,

[1] For example, that which dispensed the canons from receiving the legates in procession, a favour which was reserved for the Pope, the king, and the archbishop once in his life.

[2] See the two deeds granted to St. Martin at Tours.—BARON., *Ann.*, ad ann. 1096. . . . "Ut Romanæ Ecclesiæ præcepta servantes Romanæ Ecclesiæ libertate perpetua gaudeatis, salvo . . . jure, seu consuetudine, quam hactenus erga vos Turonensis noscitur archiepiscopus habuisse . . . si quis sane in crastinum Archiepiscopus, aut Episcopus, Imperator aut Rex," &c.

[3] By a deed given at Saintes, Easter Day, 1096.

[4] GOFFRID., i. 2, ep. 11, 27; MABILL., *Ann.*, b. 69, p. 34. The bishops desired the participation by all the principal abbots of their sees in their election; because it became a guarantee of the submission of all these prelates in every matter which was not the object of a special exemption. Thus, in 1089, we find the Bishop of Autun cruelly persecuting Abbot Hugh of Flavigny, because he had sent a deputy to the bishop's election instead of going himself. Hugh was finally expelled from his abbey by the treason of his monks, and in spite of the favourable sentence of the Council of Valence in 1100. He is author of a much-esteemed chronicle on the history of the eleventh century.

the privilege by which the dignity of cardinal was united to that of abbot.[1]

Urban II. freed Glanfeuil, the first Benedictine foundation in France, from the yoke of the degenerate monks of St. Maur-les-Fossés, near Paris.[2] After passing eight days at Marmoutier, where he consecrated the church and cemetery, and where he and his cardinals dined in the refectory, the Pope went to the banks of the Loire. Here, from a wooden pulpit,[3] erected beside the river, his eloquent voice was heard by an immense crowd, which filled the town of St. Martin, and by the great personages of the neighbourhood, who formed the duke's *cortège*.

Leaving Marmoutier, Urban held a new council at Tours, where he refused absolution to King Philip, and wrote to the bishops of France, blaming those among them who thought they might communicate with an excommunicated prince and absolve him themselves.[4] This steadiness in apostolic severity did not render him unjust; for, by the advice of Yves of Chartres, who went with him everywhere, he approved the election to the see of Paris of the young William de Montfort, brother of that Bertrade whose love had drawn King Philip into sin. William had not yet reached the age fixed by the canons; but Yves, Bertrade's inflexible enemy, had observed in her brother a mind so zealous for the good of the Church, that he persuaded the sovereign pontiff to sanction this choice.

Meanwhile, towards the end of the period fixed by the Council of Clermont, the king consented to humble himself,

[1] The Abbots of Vendôme enjoyed this privilege for 300 years. As cardinals, they took their title from the Church of St. Prisca at Rome.

[2] "A Fossatensium tyrannide libertati restituit."—*Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 18. Their rule was much relaxed.—MAB., b. 69.

[3] "In gradu ligneo."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Auditum est apud nos quosdam confratres nostros in tantam audaciam prorupisse, ut asserant se nequaquam a regis societate abstenturos . . . nobis sane et omnibus Turonis nobiscum Deo propitiante convenerunt, liquido paruit . . . nullam solvendi quem nos ligavimus Fraternitati vestræ suppetere potestatem."—COLETT., *Conc.*, xii. 736.

and resolved to break off his unlawful union. His long-deferred absolution immediately followed: it took place during the meeting of the Council of Nîmes, July 8, 1096.[1]

Before returning to Italy, Urban II. extended his cares to Spain, where the contest between Christians and Saracens continued uninterruptedly. It was during this year (1096)[2] that Avesca fell before the two kings of Aragon, one of whom, Sancho Ramirez, being mortally wounded under the walls of the place, made his successor swear never to raise the siege. During this time, the Clunist Bernard, Archbishop of Toledo, had joined Urban in France, purposing, like his compatriots, to take part in the Crusade; but the Pope sent him back to Spain to organise the war with the infidels.[3] Finally, Urban, having gloriously ended his mission beyond the Alps, turned once more towards Italy, where, thanks to the Lombard bishops, the emperor still maintained his position.

The cause of the Church had just suffered from the defection of Duke Welf and his son, the husband of Matilda. Deceived, as it would appear, in their expectations by the persistent intention of the great countess to give her property to the Holy See, they deserted their party and joined that of the emperor;[4] but the heroic Matilda

[1] "Satis humiliter ad satisfactionem venit, et abjurata adultera in gratiam receptus est, seque in servitio domini Papæ promptum exhibuit." —BERNOLD. CONST., ad ann. 1096. In this same council, the Pope published a canon which confirmed to monks the right of exercising sacerdotal functions agreeably to the decree of the Council of Rome, under Boniface IV., in 604. This canon interfered in no way with that of Clermont, which denied them the government of parishes. Fleury attacks it bitterly. We always find, side by side, in a mind like his, three hostilities—against the authority of the Holy See, against the independence of monks, and against the worship of the Blessed Virgin—a certain sign of more or less pronounced connivance with the enemies of the Church.

[2] PAGI, crit. in BARON., 1094, No. 21.

[3] Besides the future anti-pope, Maurice Burdin, a monk of Uzerches, Bernard took back with him to Spain a monk of Moissac, Gerard, who became Archbishop of Braga, and died 1110; he is honoured as a saint.

[4] "Dux . . . Henricum sibi in adjutorem adscivit contra dominam

braved all three, and succeeded in preserving for the Pope possession of all the territory she had conceded to him.

Urban first went to Milan, which he found steadfast in its anti-imperialist disposition. He there canonised as a martyr the Knight Herlembald, who, holding the banner of St. Peter, had fallen under the knives of the simoniacal and married priests of Rome (1075).

The Pope also preached against simony, *in pulpito sanctæ Theclæ*, to an immense multitude, declaring to them that the lowest of the inferior clergy counted for more in the Church of God than the greatest monarch.[1]

From Milan the sovereign pontiff went to Rome, where most of the inhabitants had now recognised his authority, and where he solemnly celebrated the feast of Christmas, though St. Angelo was still occupied by the anti-Pope Guibert, the steady adversary of all expeditions to the Holy Land.[2] It was about this time that Godfrey of Bouillon traversed Germany amidst the acclamations of the multitudes who firmly believed that Charlemagne was about to revive in order to lead them against the enemies of Christ.[3] It was then also that the French shout of "*Dieu le veut*" was first heard in Italy,[4] and turning the minds of the Normans there

Mathildem ut ipsam bona sua filio ejus dare compelleret, quamvis nondum illam in maritali opere cognosceret."—BERN., ad 1095. According to STENTZEL, vol. i. p. 553, and LABBE, *Chron.*, ii. 258, the defection of the Welfs dated from 1095; but no sign of it appears before the Pope's journey into France.

[1] "In pulpito sanctæ Theclæ immensæ multitudini utriusque sexus prædicavit, quod minimus clericus de Ecclesia Dei major quolibet rege mortali."—LANDULPH. DE ST. PAUL, *Chron. Mediol.*, c. 28, ap. MURATORI.

[2] RAUMER, *History of the Hohenstaufens*, vol. i. c. 3.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] "Interea Boamundus Roberti ducis filius . . . cœlesti instinctu protinus jussit afferri pannum sericum, totumque in frustra concidi, ut tam sibi quam suis et aliis ad se confluentibus, cruces inde confectas superponeret humeris, omnesque itidem *Deus lo volt* clamare magnis vocibus jussit. . . . Tam multi repente confluxere ut vix paucis cum comite Rogerio scilicet relictis, in Siciliam solus ferme redierit."—*Chron. Cass.*, b. iv. c. 11; ORDER. VIT., b. ix.; GUILL. TYR., b. ii. c. 20.

from their scarcely-completed conquests in Apulia and Sicily, hurried them away to the East.

Bohemond, the eldest son of Robert Guiscard, started with the flower of Count Roger's army; and in spite of his ardent desire to avenge on his way the injuries heaped on his race by the treacherous Byzantines, he was obliged to go on straight towards Jerusalem, carried away by the ardent zeal of his companions, and especially of the heroic Tancred.[1]

A certain number of French princes—Hugh de Vermandois, the king's brother, Robert, Duke of Normandy, and Stephen, Count of Blois—chose the Italian route, so as to pass by Berne before reaching the holy city. Arriving at Lucca, they heard that the Pope was in the neighbourhood, and all went to ask his blessing,[2] happy, says the chronicler, to continue their journey with such a viaticum.

Henry IV. seemed desirous to avoid the contact of these Catholic legions. Crossing the Alps, he rapidly quitted Italy, which he was never to see again,[3] thus leaving the territories where he had most partisans to the energetic action of Matilda and the moral influence of the Pope.

Urban thus found himself victorious at Rome, and more disposed than ever, according to the exhortations of his faithful friend, Bishop Yves of Chartres, to strive like St. Peter and to reign like him.[4]

[1] "Tertia pars per antiquam viam Romam venit."—ANON., *Hist. bell. sacr.*, in MAB., *Mus. Ital.*, i. 2.

[2] "Cum usque Lucam pervenissemus, invenimus prope urbem illam Urbanum apostolicum, cum quo locuti sunt comes Robertus Normannus, et comes Stephanus, nos quoque ceteri qui voluimus. Et ab eo benedictione suscepta, gaudentes Romam ivimus."—FULCHER CARNOT, *Hist. Hierosol.*, i. 2. In this writer is found an account of the insults the Crusaders suffered at the hands of the partisans of the anti-Pope Guibert, at Rome: nothing can show more clearly the antipathy of the schismatics for the Crusades.

[3] He returned to Germany May 15, 1097.—STENTZEL, *Tabl. Chron.*

[4] "Domno et patri suo Urbano . . . cum Petro pugnare et cum Petro regnare. Quoniam Romana Ecclesia post multa naufragia sub vestro regimine ad portum pene pervenit, et Italia regnum tamdiu rebelle in conspectu vestro totum pene conticuit."—*Ep.*, YVON CARNOT., 43.

CHAPTER V

ROYALTY AND THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH

A great contemporary of Urban II. and Peter the Hermit.—Anselm of Aosta and his philosophy.—Influence of Anselm on the intelligence of the middle ages.—The Abbot of Bec as popular in England as in France. —His friends not less numerous in the world than in the cloister.—Anselm's heart overflowing with love for his friends and charity for his enemies.—Anselm suddenly snatched from the solitude of the cloister. —King William Rufus and his minister, Ralph Flambard.—Hugh the Wolf, Earl of Chester, brings Anselm to England.—The king's sudden illness, repentance, and vain promises.—Anselm suffers violence before he will accept the English primacy.—The Archbishop of Rouen orders Anselm to obey the king's wish.—Consecration of Anselm by St. Wulstan.—William Rufus false to all his promises.—Encouraging words of St. Wulstan.—Anselm will not buy the king's favour.—The Bishop of Durham takes part against Anselm.—Admirable words of a knight.— Intervention of the barons in Anselm's favour.—King William sends two clerks of his chapel to Rome.—He refuses Anselm leave to go to Rome.—The English bishops abandon their metropolitan.

WHILE a French monk was so worthily occupying the throne of St. Peter—while another monk was leading to the East the flower of European chivalry, called to arms by his eloquence—there was a third, in England, who, compelled to struggle against all the abuses and all the cunning of the temporal power, prepared a yet more splendid glory for the Church and the world. So rich were at that moment the Christian world, the Church, and especially the monastic orders, in men of courage and genius!

Born at Aosta, in 1033, of a very rich patrician family,[1] Anselm had early suffered those trials by which great souls

[1] "Juxta seculi dignitatem nobiliter nati, nobiliter sunt in Augusta conversati . . . ambo diviti is non ignobiles."—EADM., *Vit. S. Anselm*, p. 2.

are so often tempered. When a child he lost his mother, and, as the pious author [1] of his life expresses it, "the ship of his heart was deprived of its anchor, and he remained a wreck amidst the waves of the world," [2] an object of aversion to his father, and obliged to leave his native land. The fame of Lanfranc drew the young man to Bec, where, with indefatigable zeal, he gave himself up to work. Love of study led him by degrees to love of solitude and monastic penance. After some efforts he succeeded in mastering the passion for literary glory which at first had urged him to leave the place where the reputation of Lanfranc seemed to render all rivalry impossible.[3] He triumphed more easily over the temptation offered by a great fortune inherited from his father. At the age of twenty-seven he became a monk in the abbey of Bec, where he was soon to replace Lanfranc as prior; [4] and fifteen years later,[5] at the death of

[1] Eadmer, a monk of Canterbury, and afterwards Archbishop of St. Andrews, in Scotland, was Anselm's companion in travel and exile, having received from him a bond of special obedience, as authorised by Pope Urban. He has related, *inconcussa veritate*, he says, the life of his friend in two works, entitled *De Vita S. Anselm*, and *Historia Novorum*. One contains the details of the monastic and familiar life of the saint; the other the events of his contest with the King of England. D. Gerberon has published them, with notes by the learned Selden, at the end of the works of St. Anselm, 1721. Eadmer relates that Anselm one day discovered the work at which he was occupied, and after having first examined and corrected it, ordered him to destroy what he had already transcribed from his waxen tablets on to parchment. But Eadmer only obeyed after he had secretly made another copy.—*Supplement*, c. 68, p. 215. The historian agrees perfectly with William of Malmesbury, a writer very favourable to the Norman dynasty. Among moderns, no one has better related the life of Anselm than the anonymous author of two articles in Nos. 66 and 67 of the *British Critic*, a magazine belonging to the new Anglo-Catholic sect.

[2] "Defuncta vero illa, illico navis cordis ejus, quasi anchora perdita, in fluctus seculi pene tota dilapsa est."—*Vit. S. Ans.*, p. 2.

[3] "Ecce monachus fiam, sed ubi? . . . Becci supereminens prudentia Lanfranci, qui illic monachus est, me aut nulli prodesse, aut nihil valere comprobabit. . . . Nec dum eram edomitus, necdum in me vigebat mundi contemptus. . . ."—EADM., p. 3.

[4] In 1063.

[5] In 1078.

the venerable Herluin, founder of the monastery,[1] he found himself, in spite of his eager resistance, named abbot by the 136 monks of the community.

In great distress he threw himself weeping at the feet of the monks, imploring them not to lay such a burden upon him; but they, kneeling before him, entreated him to have pity on their souls and on their house.[2] Anselm therefore passed thirty years at Bec, partly as monk, partly as superior, dividing his time between the exact practice of monastic austerities,[3] and the continuation of his studies. He applied himself specially to sounding the most delicate and difficult problems of metaphysics, and, guided by the light of faith and humility, did not fear to face questions hitherto judged insoluble.[4] "I believe, but I desire to understand,"[5] said the Christian philosopher; and these efforts to reach the comprehension of truths imposed by religion have given us the magnificent treatises, in which the writer, thus constituting himself the disciple and successor of St. Augustine,[6] has given to the questions of the divine essence, the existence of God, the incarnation, the creation, the Trinity, free will, and grace, solutions and illustrations which even to our own days have retained the highest value in the eyes of theology and true philosophy,[7] of reason, and of faith. On account

[1] See above.

[2] "At illi omnes e contra in terram prostrati, orant ut ipse potius loci illius et eorum misereatur."—EADM., p. 9. The Archbishop of Rouen had laid upon him the obligation of obedience to the choice of which he should be the object.

[3] "Quid de illius jejunio dicerem, cum ab initio prioratus sui tanta corpus suum inedia maceraverit . . . quid de vigiliis. . . ."—EADM., p. 4.

[4] "Soli Deo, cœlestibusque disciplinis jugiter occupatus, in tantum speculationis divinæ culmen ascenderet, ut obscurrissimas et ante suum tempus insolitas de divinitate Dei et nostra fide quæstiones, Deo reserante perspiceret, ac perspecats erodaret, apertisque rationibus quæ dicebat rata et catholica esse probaret."—EADM., p. 3.

[5] "Credo, sed intelligere desidero . . . and he gave as second title to his *Proslogion:* Fides quærens intellectum."—Procem.

[6] Procem.—*Monologii.*

[7] His most famous treatises (the *Monologium*, which contains the de-

of these works Anselm has deservedly been regarded by the most competent judges as the father and founder of Christian philosophy in the middle ages. The ardent sincerity with which he submitted all the results of his researches to the rules of faith and the infallible authority of the Church,[1] places an impassable abyss between his tendencies and those of modern metaphysicians. He seems to have pointed out beforehand this immeasurable gulf when, speaking of the rationalists of his own time, he said, "They seek for reasons because they do not believe; we seek for them because we do believe."[2] And he adds, "I do not try to understand that I may believe; but I believe that I may understand."[3] "If," continues the great philosopher, "our reason is contradicted by the authority of Holy Scripture, we must allow, however unanswerable our reason may appear, that she is

monstration of God by the idea we possess of infinite perfection, the *Proslogion*, the *Liber Apologeticus*, the dialogues *De Veritate*, *De libero Arbitrio*, *De Casu Diaboli*, &c.) were composed, according to D. Gerberon, during the fifteen years of his priory. To form a just idea of St. Anselm's philosophical leanings, it is necessary to read the essay on his scholastic theology, to be found in the *Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze* of the admirable Möhler, author of the *Symbolique*, published after his death by Dr. Döllinger. Apart from the orthodox point of view, the reader may profitably consult the preface to the translation of the *Monologium* and *Proslogium*, published in 1841 by M. Bouchitté, Professor at Versailles, under the utterly incorrect title of *Christian Rationalism*. In 1842, M. Franck, a Protestant, published at Tubingen an essay on St. Anselm, in which he points out and refutes, in a rationalist sense, most of the saint's demonstrations, while doing all justice to his moral and public life. He acknowledges him to have been a *perfect monk*. But, adds the philosopher, Anselm shared "many of his mother's weaknesses," and was especially wanting in subjective freedom of mind—*Die subjective Geistes Freiheit*. This says everything, and proves, without much trouble, the inferiority of the monk and son of the Church compared with the doctors of the nineteenth century.

[1] See, among others, the humble letter in which he submitted his treatises to the judgment of Lanfranc, already archbishop.—Ep. i. 63, 68; iv. 103.

[2] "Illi ideo rationem quærunt, quia non credunt; nos vero quia credimus."—*Cur Deus homo*, b. i. c. 2.

[3] "Neque enim quæro intelligere, ut credam; sed credo, ut intelligam."—*Proslog.*, c. 1.

entirely in the wrong.[1] No Christian should in any way dispute truths the Catholic Church believes and confesses; he may only, while preserving his faith from all hurt, and conforming his life to it, humbly examine the manner in which these truths exist. If he is able to understand, let him give thanks to God; if not, let him not set himself up against the truth, but bend his head in reverence before it.[2] . . . There are men of false learning who, before they have gained a knowledge of the faith, fly at the highest sovereign questions; . . . not able to understand what they believe, they dispute the truth of that faith which the fathers have confirmed. As if the owls and bats, and other creatures who only see by night, should dispute as to the light of day with eagles who look with undazzled eye upon the sun himself." [3]

Anselm was not content to compose only metaphysical works. He wrote also meditations and orations abounding in the treasures of ascetic piety,[4] of the deepest love for God and His saints, and especially for Mary,[5] the mother of Him whom he did not fear to call the Elder Brother of Christians.[6] Night was the time principally occupied by these works,

[1] "At si ipsa nostro sensui indubitanter repugnat, quamvis nobis nostra ratio videatur inexpugnabilis, nulla tamen veritate fulciri credenda est."—*De concord. Grat.*, and *Lib. arbit. quæst.*, iii. c. 6.

[2] "Nullus quippe Christianus debet disputare quomodo quod catholica Ecclesia corde credit . . . non sit, sed . . . quærere rationem quomodo sit. Si potest intelligere, Deo gratias agat: si non potest, non immittat cornua ad ventilandum, sed submittat caput ad venerandum."—*De Fide Trinitatis*, c. 2.

[3] "Velut si vespertiliones et noctuæ, non nisi in nocte cœlum videntes, de meridianis solis radiis disceptent contra aquilas solem ipsum irreverberato visu intuentes."—*Ibid.* How is it possible to have ventured to represent the man who wrote these words as a Christian rationalist?

[4] "In orationibus autem quas ipse juxta desiderium et petitionem amicorum suorum scriptas edidit; qua sollicitudine, quo timore, qua spe, quo amore Deum et sanctos ejus interpellaverit . . . satis est et me tacente videre."—EADM., p. 4.

[5] See his orations, 45 to 60, and his letters to Gondulphus.—Ep. i. p. 20.

[6] "Magne Domine, tu noster major frater; magna Domina, tu nostra melior mater."—*Orat.* 51.

and by the transcription and correction of MSS.[1] His days were absorbed by the spiritual direction of those who came to him,[2] by the paternal instruction he freely gave to youth,[3] and by assiduous care of the sick. Some loved him as a father, others as a mother, so well did he know how to gain the confidence and console the grief of all.[4] . . . He acted as servant to an old monk paralysed by age and suffering, himself putting the food into his mouth.[5] He would willingly have buried his whole life in this sacred obscurity, so as to render himself worthy of the habit which he wore.[6]

When his friends exhorted him to make his works known, reproaching him for hiding his light under a bushel—when they spoke to him of the glory of Lanfranc and Guitmond, monks like himself, and in the same province, he answered, "Flowers of the same colour as the rose have not always the same perfume."[7] By degrees, nevertheless, his fame spread; his treatises and meditations passed from hand to hand, and excited universal admiration in France, Flanders, and England. From the depths of Auvergne the monks of Chaise-Dieu wrote to him that at the mere reading of his works, they imagined that they saw his tears of contrition and piety, and that their hearts seemed to be flooded as with sweet and refreshing dew.[8] He soon had as many friends

[1] "Præterea libros, qui ante id temporis nimis corrupti ubique terrarum erant, nocte corrigebat."—EADM., p. 4.

[2] "Totus dies in dandis consiliis sæpissime non sufficiebat. . . ."—*Ibid.*

[3] EADM., pp. 5 and 8.—See the lesson he gave to an abbot guilty of extreme severity towards his pupils.

[4] "Sicque sanis pater, et infirmis erat mater . . . quicquid secreti apud se quivis illorum habebat, non secus quam dulcissimæ matri ille revelare satagebat."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Quod tu Herewarde decrepite senex in teipso percepisti quando gravatus . . . ita ut nihil tui corporis præter linguam, haberes in tua potestate per manus illius pastus, et vino de racemis per uvam in aliam ejus manum expresso, de ejus ipsa manu bibens et refocillatus."—*Ibid.*

[6] He called himself "Frater Anselmus vita peccator, habitu monachus."

[7] "Quid vero quæritis cur fama Lanfranci atque Guitmundi plus mea per orbem volet? Utique quia non quilibet flos pari rosæ fragrat odore, etiamsi non dispari fallat rubore."—Ep. i. 16.

[8] "Pias præstant nobis lacrymas tuas legere, nostras edere; ita ut

in the world as in the cloister. There was about him a charm which vanquished the souls of men. The Norman knights surrounded him with the liveliest affection, received him with delight in their castles, confided their children to him, and considered him as an elder brother.[1]

In England, whither the affairs of his monastery often took him, his popularity was as great as in Normandy; the whole country was devoted to him, and there were earls, knights, and noble ladies who would have thought themselves deprived of all merit before God if the Abbot of Bec had not received some proof of devotion from their hands.[2] He availed himself of this ascendancy to preach mortification and humility to the rich and noble of both sexes. His voluminous correspondence[3] everywhere bears the marks of this task, and when the position of those he addressed permitted it, he used double efforts to induce them to embrace the monastic life. He made many valuable conquests among them,[4] employing for the purpose the ardent love which animated him, and which gave invincible power to his eloquence.[5] "Beloved friends of my soul," he wrote to two of

utrumque miremur, et in corde tuo redundare tantæ rorem benedictionis, et sine susurro descendere inde rivum in cordibus nostris."—Ep. i. 61.

[1] EADM., pp. 8 and 33. "Dominus iste . . . de Normannorum nobilissimis . . . cum matre et fratribus suis et sorore . . . primogeniti mihi dignitatem concesserunt."—Ep. i. 18; see also 67 *et passim.*

[2] "Non fuit comes in Anglia seu comitissa, vel ulla persona potens, qua non judicaret se sua coram Deo merita perdidisse, &c. . . . Familiaris ei dehinc Anglia facta est."—EADM., p. 11. We have seen already how William the Conqueror grew mild with Anselm.

[3] We have 450 of his letters, which give us the true key to his character and history. We will say for this correspondence, as well as for that of Gregory VII., that to publish it in a portable form, and add it to Eadmer's biography of the saint, would be to render an essential service to history and to religious truth.

[4] See the treasurer of Beauvais (*adolescens delicatus et pulcherrimus, valde dives et nobilissimus*), of whom he speaks, Ep. ii. 19, and the three noble ladies, Basilia de Gournay, Auffrida her mother, and Eve de Crespin.—*Chron. Becc. Mams*, quoted by SELDEN, ap. GERBER, p. 559.

[5] See, among others (Ep. ii. 25, 29, 39; *Lamberto nobili viro*, p. 40), to

his near relations whom he wished to draw to Bec, "my eyes ardently desire to see you, my arms open to embrace you, my lips sigh for your kisses, all the life that remains in me wears itself out in waiting for you. . . . I hope in prayer, and I pray in hope. Come and taste how good the Lord is; you cannot know it as long as you find sweetness in the life of the world. . . . I cannot deceive you, first of all because I love you, and secondly, because I have experience of what I speak of. Let us then be monks together, so that now and for ever we may be one flesh, one blood, one soul. . . . My heart is joined to yours. You can break it, but you cannot separate them; neither can you loosen it, nor drag it into the world. I must say to you, 'Either live here with it, or break it.' But God preserve you from doing such wrong to a poor heart which has never wronged you, and which loves you. Oh, how my love burns! How my affection labours to make itself felt! But no words are sufficient. I would write many things to you, but time fails, and I cannot express what I feel. Speak, then, O good Jesus, speak to their hearts. Thou who alone canst make them understand, tell them to leave all and follow Thee. Do not separate me from those whom Thou hast bound to me by the bonds of blood and affection. Be my witness, Lord, with these tears which flow while I write."[1] Contrary to the common opinion, the heart of Anselm, far from being chilled by study or the macerations of penance,

Ermengarde, whose husband wished to become a monk, but who refused to be a nun.

[1] "Animæ dilectissimæ, animæ meæ . . . concupiscunt oculi mei vultus vestros, extendunt se bracchia mea in amplexus vestros. Anhelat ad oscula vestra os meum . . . vosque non fallo, quia amicus sum, certe nec fallo quia expertus sum . . . consolidastis animam meam animabus vestris. Scindi potest, secerni jam non potest. . . . O quomodo inter præcordia mea fervet amor meus! Quomodo laborat totus erumpere simul affectus meus! . . . Dic tu, o bone Jesu, cordibus eorum . . . promitte illis . . . nec separes a me quibus me tanto carnis et spiritus affectu junxistis. . . . Domine, tu testis es interius et lachrymæ quæ, me hoc scribente, fluunt, testes sunt, exterius," &c.—Ep. ii. 28.

overflowed with tenderness. Among the monks of Bec there were several whom he loved with passionate affection: the young Maurice, whose health filled him with painful anxiety;[1] Lanfranc,[2] nephew of the archbishop, to whom he wrote, "Do not think that, according to the vulgar saying, what is far from the eyes is far from the heart; if it were so, the longer thou wert absent from me, the weaker my affection would grow; whereas, on the contrary, the less I can enjoy thy presence, the more ardently my soul desires it."[3] A third youth, named Gondulphus, also destined to the service of the altar, had gained, in the peaceful solitude of the cloister, all Anselm's affection, and received this letter from him: "For all my salutation, I write to thee these simple words: Anselm to Gondulphus. And, in effect, this short salutation must appear to thee enough at the head of my letter, for what could I say more to him I love? Can any who knows Gondulphus and Anselm fail to understand how much love is expressed in these two words?"[4] Elsewhere he adds, "How can I forget you? Do we forget him whom we have placed like a seal upon our hearts? Even your silence tells me that you love me; and in the same way, when I am silent, you guess that I love you. Not only have I no doubt of you, but I am certain that you also have full confidence in me.[5] . . . What can my letter

[1] See the five letters, 24–28, of b. i., on the headache from which Maurice suffered, and letters 32 and 34 on his recovery.

[2] He also suffered from an illness similar to Maurice's, of which St. Anselm gives a curious and detailed description.—Ep. i. 31.

[3] "Non sicut vulgo dici solet, quia quod longe est ab oculis longe est a corde . . . quanto minus illa frui pro voto possum, tanto magis desiderium ejus in veri dilectoris vestri mente fervescit."—Ep. i. 66.

[4] "Quisquis enim bene novit Gondulphum et Anselmum, cum legit, Gondulfo Anselmus, non ignorat quid subaudiatur, vel quantus subintelligatur affectus."—Ep. i. 7.

[5] "Qualiter namque obliviscar tui? Te silente, ego novi quia diligis me, et me tacente, scis quia amo te. Tu mihi conscius es quia ego non dubito de te; et ego tibi testis sum quia tu certus es de me."—Ep. i. 4.

tell you that you do not know already, O soul of my soul? Look into the secret depths of your heart, see what tenderness you find there for me, and you will understand what mine is for you!"[1]

The young Gislebert, another friend of Anselm's,[2] having left Bec, the latter wrote to him, "You knew, my friend, how much I loved you; but I did not know. He who has separated us has alone taught me how dear you are to me. . . . No, I did not know until I felt the trial of your absence, how sweet it is to me to have you, how bitter not to have you! To console you, another friend is near you, whom you love as well, or perhaps better, than me; but I —I have you no longer, and no one, you may be sure, can replace you. Consolations are offered to you; but I am alone with my grief. Those who rejoice to have you near them, may perhaps be offended at what I say; but let them be content with their good fortune, and suffer me to weep for him who has been taken from me, and whose place no other can fill."[3]

Death had no more power than absence to extinguish in the heart of the monk these flames of holy love. At the time when Anselm was made prior, a young monk named Osborn, jealous, like several others, of this promotion, took a violent dislike to him[4] and showed his antipathy with a sort of frenzy. Anselm neglected nothing to gain the heart of his enemy by force of indulgence and kindness;[5] he won

[1] "Sed quid te docebit epistola mea quod ignores, o tu altera anima? Intra in cubiculum cordis tui. . . ."—Ep. i. 14. See also Ep. i. 33.

[2] Perhaps Gislebert of the house of Crespin, so celebrated for his liberality. After having been a monk at Bec, he was made Abbot of Westminster in 1084.

[3] "Et quidem tu sciebas erga te dilectionem meam: sed utique ego ipse nesciebam eam. Qui nos scidit ab invicem, ille me docuit quantum te diligerem. Tu habes præsentem alterum quem non minus aut certe plus amas: mihi vero tu, tu inquam, es ablatus, et nullus pro te oblatus," &c.—Ep. i. 75.

[4] "More canino."—Eadm., p. 4.

[5] "Cœpit quadam sancta calliditate piis blandimentis delinire."—*Ibid.*

him to repentance; nursed him night and day in his last illness; and when Anselm received his latest sigh, the rebel had become almost a saint.

For a whole year Anselm never failed to say a mass each morning for his old enemy; nor ceased to write to his friends to ask their prayers for the same object.

"I beg you," he wrote to Gondulphus, "you and all my brothers, with all the strength of my affection, to pray for Osborn; his soul is mine, and I will accept all that you do for him during my life as if you did it for me; and when I am dead, when you think of me, do not, I conjure you, forget the soul of my beloved Osborn. If I am too troublesome to you, forget me, but remember him.[1] . . . Oh you who surround me, and who have loved me, keep him as myself in your memory, and let this memory remain living in your heart as in mine."[2]

Such was the man who, after thirty years of such a life, was, at the age of sixty—the age of repose—to be snatched by the hand of God from the deep solitude of the cloister to go among men, and there to fight one of the greatest of battles against royal despotism.

History relates that when, after the death of Gregory VII., William the Conqueror was also drawing near to the tomb, and reviewing, upon his deathbed,[3] all the violences of the Norman Conquest, he prayed the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, that she would deign to have mercy on him for the sake of the many monastic[4] foundations he

[1] "Anima ejus anima mea est. Accipiam igitur in illo vivus quicquid ab amicitia poteram sperare defunctus, ut sint otiosi me defuncto. . . . Precor et precor, et precor, memento mei, et ne obliviscaris animæ Osberni dilecti mei. Quod si te nimis video ronerare, mei obliviscere et illius memorare."—Ep. i. 4.

[2] "Eos interiori cubiculo memoriæ tuæ ibi, ubi ego assiduus assideo . . . colloca mecum in circuitu meo: sed animam Osberni mei, rogo, chare mi, illam non nisi in sinu meo."—Ep. i. 7.

[3] September 9, 1087.

[4] ORDER. VIT., b. viii. pp. 659-661.—"Dominæ meæ, sanctæ Dei genitrici Mariæ me commendo."

had made on both sides of the Channel. These foundations were, indeed, of real benefit to the people.

The crown of England passed to William the Red, to the prejudice of his elder brother Robert, whose share was only the Duchy of Normandy. To secure his recognition as king, William was obliged to swear, between the hands of Archbishop Lanfranc, that he would regard justice and mercy, and defend the peace and liberty of the Church against all.[1] But Lanfranc being dead,[2] and the restraint he had exercised withdrawn, the king gave himself up without delay to the evil inclinations of his depraved nature. The Church and people of England alike groaned under his yoke. The zeal of the Conqueror for ecclesiastical regularity, and his hatred of simony, had not prevented him from introducing into this new kingdom innovations[3] tending to abuses, and incompatible with the liberty of the Church as well as with her social mission. He had claimed the right to accept or reject at pleasure the Roman pontiff's nomination; to examine, beforehand, all pontifical letters addressed to the Church of England; to submit to the royal judgment all decrees of the national councils; finally, to forbid bishops to fulminate, without his permission, any ecclesiastical sentence against barons or royal officers even if guilty of the greatest crimes.[4] Moreover, the Conqueror had rigorously upheld the custom, inveterate in England, of obliging bishops and abbots to receive investiture by the crosier, at the hands of the king, and to do him homage.[5] But the Red

[1] EADMER, *Hist. Nov.*, i. p. 33.

[2] May 27, 1089. One of the last acts of this illustrious monk, who called himself "Lanfranc, a sinner, and unworthy archbishop of the holy Church of Canterbury," was to write to two kings of Ireland to recommend them to watch over the inviolability of marriages in their country. He sent them Bishop Patrick, *monasticis institutionibus a pueritia enutritum*, who had come to him to be consecrated.—BARON., *Ann.*, ad ann. 1089.

[3] "Quædam de eis quæ nova per Angliam servare constituit ponam." —EADM., p. 29.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] "Per dationem virgæ pastoralis."—EADM., *in præf. Hist. Nov.*

King [1] was not content with this; not only did he prevent the English Church from pronouncing in favour of the legitimate pope against the anti-pope, when all Europe, except the emperor's partisans, recognised Urban II.; [2] but also, unlike his father, he scandalised all the country by his debauchery, brought back to favour that simony which the Conqueror, on his deathbed, boasted of having extirpated, and made the Church the victim of unparalleled rapacity. A priest's son, Ralph Flambard or the Firebrand, who had been a serving-man at the Norman court,[3] and who owed his name to the brutal violence of his extortions,[4] had the whole confidence of the young king, and guided him in his robberies. When a prelate died, the agents of the royal treasury flung themselves upon the vacant diocese or abbey, made themselves the sovereign administrators of it, upset order and discipline, reduced the monks to the condition of hirelings, and filled their master's coffers with the wealth which the piety of former kings had assured to the Church.[5]

Eadmer maintains that investiture by the crosier dates only from the Conqueror; but Selden (in EADM., *not.*, p. 104) quotes several authorities which prove that it was more ancient.

[1] "In curia Rupi Regis."—ORD. VIT., viii. 682.

[2] SIMEON DUNELMENSIS, ann. 1091; PAGI, *Crit.*, ad ann. 1089.

[3] "Cujusdam plebeii presbyteri de pago Baiocensi filius . . . inter pedissequos curiales cum vilibus parasitis educatus."—ORD., *loc. cit.* William made him Bishop of Durham.

[4] "Flamma quippe ardens . . . intulit genti novos ritus, quibus crudeliter oppressit populorum cœtus, et Ecclesiæ cantus temporales mutavit in planctus . . . supplices regiæ fidelitati plebes indecenter oppressit."—*Ibid.* St. Anselm says of him: "*Publicanorum princeps infamissimus* . . . propter crudelitatem similem flammæ comburenti pronomine Flambardus."—Ep. iv. 2.

[5] "Videres insuper quotidie (spreta servorum dei religione) quosque nefandissimos hominum regias pecunias exigentes per claustra monasterii torvo et minaci voltu procedere, hinc inde præcipere, minas intentare," &c.—EADM., *loc. cit.* "Ecclesias . . . cuilibet satellitum suorum subegit . . . suo infert ærario largas opes quas Ecclesiæ Dei gratanter et devote dederunt antiqui Anglorum reges."—ORDER., p. 679. "Monachis victum ac vestitum cum parcitate erogabant, cetera vero regiis thesauris ingerebant."—*Id.*, p. 763.

All the domains were put up to auction, and the last bidder could never be sure that his offers would not be surpassed by some new-comer to whom the king had yielded the purchase.[1] The shame of the clergy, and the misery of the poor may be imagined[2] when this ignoble oppression was suddenly substituted for the maternal administration of the Church! In spite of all complaints the king continued this state of things, and when it pleased him to fill up the vacancies, he sold the abbeys or bishoprics to the mercenary clergy who thronged his court.[3]

In this way the infamous Flambard became Bishop of Durham. England descended to the level of Germany in the youth of Henry IV. It needed a new Gregory VII. to rescue her. When the Archbishop of Canterbury died, William had no inclination to let slip so good an opportunity of enriching himself at the cost of God and the churches; he kept the see vacant for nearly four years, thus giving up the foremost churches of his kingdom to such exactions and disorders that more than thirty parishes saw their churchyards turned into pastures.[4] No church escaped the royal extortions. The king declared that sooner or later he would have every crosier in England in his hands.[5] He enjoyed his misdoing, and declared, laughing, "The bread of Christ is bread that fattens."[6]

In this condition of affairs, Hugh Lupus, Earl of Chester, one of the most warlike and powerful of the Anglo-Norman barons,[7] wrote to Anselm to announce his intention of

[1] EADM., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Quid de hominibus Ecclesiæ dicam, qui tam vasta miseria . . . sunt attriti."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Quasi stipendia mercenariis, curialibus clericis seu monachis honores ecclesiasticos porrigebat."—ORDER., p. 763.

[4] *Vit. Anselm.* ex *MS. Victorin,* in edit. Gerber.

[5] "Se velle omnes baculos pastorales per totam Angliam in potestate sua habere."—WILL. THORN., p. 1704, ap. MABILL., *Ann. Ben.*

[6] "Panis Christi, panis pinguis est."—*MS. Vict., loc. cit.*

[7] "In militia promptus, in dando nimis prodigus, gaudens ludis et luxibus; mimis, equis et canibus . . . non familiam secum, sed exercitum

founding a monastery in his earldom, and to beg him to bring thither a colony of monks of Bec. Hugh had spent his life in fighting the Welsh, who had not yet submitted to the Norman yoke; he was rich and prodigal, fond of luxury and good cheer, carrying about with him an army of servants, jesters, and dogs; given to women and to all kinds of excess. But, in the heart of the knight, good often resumed its sway. His chaplain was a holy priest of Avranches, who constantly lectured and reproved him,[1] reminding him of the histories of the Old and New Testaments, and chiefly those of many warriors, irreproachable in their use of arms, such as St. George, St. Demetrius, St. Maurice, St. Sebastian, and, above all, that famous duke who ended his career by becoming a monk. The Earl of Chester had long been united to Anselm[2] by the closest friendship, and it is probable that, in the general grief excited throughout England by the prolonged vacancy of the primate's see, he may have said to the king that the Abbot of Bec appeared to him the fittest person to succeed the illustrious Lanfranc. Already, in Normandy, it had been whispered that if Anselm crossed the Channel he would surely be named archbishop in Lanfranc's place.[3] And yet nothing was less probable. How could the king, who claimed the right of investiture, and refused to acknowledge Urban II., think of Anselm? For the Abbot of Bec had not only acknowledged Urban, the friend of France, but had even obtained from him an exemption for his abbey.[4] Add to this that he had been constantly associated in the efforts of

semper ducebat. . . . Ventris ingluvici serviebat. . . . E pellicibus plurimam sobolem genuit."—ORDER. VIT., iv. 522, and vi. 598.

[1] ORD., *loc. cit.* He succeeded so well that Earl Hugh died a monk at the Abbey of St. Werburgh, as we have already said.

[2] "Certe amicus meus familiaris ab antiquo comes Cestrensis Hugo fuit."—EADM., p. 34.

[3] "Jam enim quodam quasi præsagio mentes quorumdam tangebantur." —*Ibid.*

[4] Ep. ii. 32, 33.

Gregory VII. against investiture, simony, and the marriage of priests, and that he had received from the pontiff, so hateful to all princes such as the Red King, this magnificent eulogy: "The perfume of thy virtue has reached us, and we thank God for it; we embrace thee in the love of Christ, and hold it certain that thy example will strengthen the Church, and that thy prayers may by God's mercy snatch her from the dangers which threaten her." [1]

Meanwhile, in spite of all the incompatibilities of which we have spoken, common opinion pointed to Anselm as the successor of Lanfranc. Terrified by this sort of public presentiment, the Abbot of Bec refused to yield to the wish of the Earl of Chester; but the earl, having fallen seriously ill, renewed the invitation, swearing to Anselm that the question was simply that of the safety of his own soul, and not at all of the archbishopric.

Anselm having again refused, the earl wrote a third time, saying, "If you do not come, be sure that you will have to reproach yourself through all eternity." [2] Anselm was obliged to yield. He came and founded, by the desire of the sick man, the Abbey of St. Werburgh,[3] passing five months in England, occupied with various affairs. As not a word was said to him about the archbishopric, he ended by being completely reassured. But at Christmas 1092, the barons of the kingdom being assembled about the king for that festival, loudly complained of the unheard-of oppression and prolonged state of widowhood endured by the mother-church of the kingdom, as they called Canterbury.[4] The better to express their dissatisfaction, they begged leave of the king

[1] "Quoniam fructuum tuorum bonus odor ad nos usque redoluit."—ANS., Ep. ii. 31; COL., *Con.* xii. 692.

[2] "Si non veneris, revera noveris quia nunquam in vita æterna in tanta requie eris, quin perpetuo doleas te ad me non venisse."—EADM., p. 34.

[3] The Abbey of St. Werburgh, where Hugh took the monastic habit before his death, was at Chester.

[4] "Omnes regni primores . . . optimi quique uno consensu de communi matre Regni quererentur."—EADM., p. 34.

to have prayers put up in all the English churches that God would inspire him to choose a worthy primate.[1]

William, very angry, answered that they might pray as they pleased, but that all their prayers would not prevent his acting as pleased him.[2] They took him at his word, and the bishops who were most interested charged Abbot Anselm, who was thinking nothing of the matter, to arrange or draw up the required prayers. He did it in such a way as to win the applause of all the nobles,[3] and the churches soon resounded with these solemn supplications. One day a nobleman, talking with the king privately on this subject, said, "We have never known so holy a man as this Anslem, Abbot of Bec. He loves nothing but God, and desires nothing in this world." "Really!" answered the king, jestingly; "not even the archbishopric of Canterbury?" "Even less the archbishopric of Canterbury than anything else," replied the nobleman; "at least that is my opinion and the opinion of many others." "Well, as for me," said the king, "I believe that he would work hand and foot if he saw any chance of getting it; but by the Holy Face of Lucca, neither he nor any one else shall have it, and there shall be no archbishop but myself while I live."[4]

Scarcely had he said these words when he fell ill, and

[1] "Quod posteris mirum dictu fortasse videbitur, ajoute."—EADMER.

[2] "Dicens quod quicquid Ecclesia peteret, ipse sine dubio pro nullo dimitteret quin faceret omne quod vellet."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Modum orandi cunctis audientibus edidit, et laudato sensu et perspicacia animi ejus, tota quæ convenerat nobilitas regni . . . in sua discessit."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Unus de principibus terræ cum rege familiariter agens . . . ita quod rex subsannans: Non, inquit, nec archiepiscopatum Cantuariensem. . . . Nec illum quidem maxime sicut mea multorumque fert opinio. Obtestatus est Rex quod manibus et pedibus plaudens in amplexum ejus accurreret, si, &c. . . . Sed per sanctum Vultum de Luca nec ipse nec hoc tempore nec aliis quis archiepiscopus erit, me excepto."—EADM., p. 35. The holy countenance of Lucca was a very ancient crucifix, attributed to Nicodemus, brought miraculously from Palestine to Lucca, where it is still venerated under the name of the Volto Santo.

was in danger of death.[1] God seemed about to avenge Himself. Bishops, abbots, and barons assembled round his sick-bed at Gloucester to receive his last sigh.[2] They sent to seek Anselm, brought him into the king's room, and begged him to advise what should be done for the salvation of their master's soul.[3] Anselm insisted upon three things —a full confession, a solemn and public promise of amendment, and the immediate execution of those measures of reparation which the bishops had already suggested. The king consented to all, and ordered his promise to be laid upon the altar. An edict was immediately drawn up, and sealed with the royal seal, promising deliverance to all State prisoners, remission of all debts due to the crown, the annulling of all prosecutions, the exact administration of justice, and the establishment, for all English people, of good and just laws.[4] Nor was this all; loud complaints reached the king of the desolation of the church of Canterbury, and William showing himself well disposed, was promptly asked whom he would choose for primate. Then, strange event! he who had sworn that Anselm should never be archbishop was the first to designate the Abbot of Bec, whose name was received with unanimous acclamations.[5]

At this shout Anselm turned pale, and absolutely refused his consent.[6] The bishops drew him aside: "What are you doing?" they said. "Do you not see that there are scarcely any Christians left in England; that all is con-

[1] "Hæc illum dicentem a vestigio valida infirmitas corripuit et lecto deposuit . . . omne usque ad exhalationem spiritus egit."—EADM., p. 35.

[2] "Nihil præter mortem ejus præstolantes."

[3] "Ingreditur ad regem, rogatur quid consilii salubrius morientis animæ judicet."

[4] "Scribitur edictum, regioque sigillo firmatur quatenus quicumque captivi in omni dominatione sua relaxentur. . . . Promittuntur insuper toto populo bonæ et sanctæ leges."

[5] "Prænuntiavit ipse et concordi voce subsequitur acclamatio omnium abbatem Anselmum tali honore dignissimum."

[6] "Expavit Anselmus ad hanc vocem, et expalluit . . . toto conamine restitit."

fusion and abomination; that our churches are threatened; that we ourselves are in danger of eternal death in consequence of this man's tyranny? And you, who could save us, will not deign to do it. What are you thinking of? The church of Canterbury calls you, waits for you; she demands the sacrifice of your liberty; will you, for the sake of your own unprofitable tranquillity, refuse to share the dangers of your brethren?"[1]

To which Anselm replied: "Observe, I beg of you, that I am old, and unfit for work. Besides, as a monk, I have always detested secular affairs." "We will help you," answered the bishops. "Do you undertake to reconcile us to God, and we will undertake all secular affairs for you."[2] "No, no; it is impossible," said Anselm; "I am abbot of a foreign monastery, I owe obedience to my archbishop, submission to my prince,[3] help and counsel to my monks. I cannot break all these ties." "These are all trifles," replied the bishops; and they drew Anselm to the bedside of the king, to whom they related the abbot's obstinate refusal.[4] "Anselm," said the sick man, "do you wish to give me up to eternal punishment?[5] My father and mother loved you, and you are willing to see their son perish, body and soul! Do you forget that I am lost if I die while I keep the archbishopric in my hands?"[6]

[1] "Quid agis, quid intendis? . . . Vides . . . ecclesias Dei in periculum mortis æternæ per tyrannidem istius hominis decidisse . . . quid, o mirabilis homo, cogitas?"

[2] "Tu Deo pro nobis intende, et nos sæcularia tua disponemus pro te."

[3] "Archiepiscopum cui obedientiam . . . principem cui subjectionem. . . ." He spoke of the Archbishop of Rouen and the Duke of Normandy.

[4] "Rapiunt igitur hominem ad regem et pervicaciam ejus exponunt."

[5] "O Anselme! quid agis? cur me pœnis æternis cruciandum tradis? Recordare, quæso, fidelis amicitiæ, &c. . . . Certus sum cum quod peribo si archiep. in meo dominio tenens vitam finiero. Succurre igitur mihi, Domine Pater. . . ."

[6] He said afterwards, recalling this scene, that at that moment death would have seemed to him a thousand times preferable to the episcopate. —EADM., p. 36.

Those present lost patience with Anselm, and declared to him that all crimes and oppressions under which England should suffer for the future would be attributed to his stubbornness. In his anguish the Abbot of Bec turned to the two monks who accompanied him, and said to them, "Ah, my brothers, why do you not help me?" One of them, sobbing,[1] answered, "If it is the will of God, father, who are we to resist Him?" "Unhappy one!" cried Anselm, "you are very ready to yield to the enemy."[2] The bishops, seeing that all was useless, blamed themselves for their weakness, and began to call, "A crosier! a crosier!"[3] Then seizing the prelate's right arm, they drew him to the bed where the king was lying, who tried to place the crosier in Anselm's hand; but as the abbot kept his fingers fast closed, the bishops were obliged to use such force to open them as made him cry out; finally, the crosier was held in the hand of the newly elect, while every one shouted, "*Long live the bishop!*" and while the *Te Deum* was chanted.[4] Then the prelate was carried to a neighbouring church, where the usual ceremonies were performed. Anselm constantly protested that all they were doing was null.[5] He was almost mad with grief; his tears, cries, and even shrieks ended by frightening those concerned; to calm him, they threw holy water over him, and even made him swallow some.[6] Having returned to

1 "Quæ verba lacrymæ, et lacrymas sanguis ubertim mox e naribus illius profluens secutus. . . ."

2 "Væ! quam cito baculus tuus confractus est." We translate as Fleury does.

3 "Virgam huc pastoralem, virgam, clamitant, pastoralem!"

4 "Episcopi vero digitos ejus strictim volæ infixos erigere conati sunt . . . ipse pro sua læsione verba dolentis ederet, tandem . . . clausæ manui ejus baculus appositus est, et episcoporum manibus cum eadem manu compressus atque retentus. Acclamante autem multitudine, *vivat episcopas*, vivat!" All these details, given by EADMER, pp. 35, 36, are confirmed by the letter of Osborn, a monk of Canterbury, to Anselm, Ep. iii. 2.

5 "Nihil est quod facitis, nihil est quod facitis."—EADM.

6 "Instantur lacrymæ meæ, et voces, et rugitus a gemitu cordis mei,

the king, Anselm told him that he would not die of this illness, but that on his recovery he would have to repair what had just been done by violence.[1] As he was retiring, accompanied by the bishops and all the nobles, he turned to them and said, "Do you know what you wish to do? You want to yoke an unbroken bull and a weak old sheep together. And what will happen? The furious bull will drag the sheep through the briers and thickets, and tear him to pieces without his having been good for anything. The Church is a plough—according to the apostle's saying, Ye are God's husbandry. This plough is drawn in England by two oxen—the king and the archbishop;—one labouring for the administration of justice and the secular government, the other for divine doctrine and discipline. One of these two, Lanfranc, is dead; there remains only the untamable bull to which you would yoke me. If you do not give up this idea, your joy of to-day will be changed into sadness — you will see the Church again widowed, even in her shepherd's lifetime; and as none of you will dare to resist him, the king will trample you under foot as he pleases." [2]

The king caused the archbishop to be instantly put in possession of all the domains of the see, and required that he should live there until the necessary answers should arrive from Normandy. They were not long delayed. The

quales nunquam de me ullo dolore memini exiisse , . . aqua benedicta me aspergentes, eam mihi potandam porrexerunt."—ANS., Ep. iii. 1.

[1] "Pro hoc volo noveris quam bene corrigere poteris quod de me nunc actum est, quia nec concessi, nec concedo ut ratum sit."—EADM., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Intelligitis quid molimini? Indomitum taurum et vetulam ac debilem ovem in aratro conjungere sub uno jugo . . . et quid inde proveniat? . . . Aratrum ecclesiam perpendite juxta apostolum dicentem *Dei agricultura estis*" (1 Cor. iii. 9). "Hoc aratrum in Anglia duo boves . . . trahunt et trahendo regunt, rex et archiepiscopus: iste sæculari justitia et imperio, ille divina doctrina et magisterio. Horum boum unus, scilicet Lanfrancus, &c. . . . vos quoque procul dubio pro libitu suo non dubitabit conculcare." This scene, so important for forming our judgment of the character of Anselm and that of his period, took place March 6, 1093.

Archbishop of Rouen ordered the newly elect, in the name of God and St. Peter, not to resist.[1] The monks of Bec had much more difficulty in consenting to the sacrifice asked of them. Anselm also grieved bitterly over the parting, for he loved nothing in the world so well as his abbey;[2] most of all, he regretted the young monks, those dear nurslings, who, as he said, were now to be weaned too early from the milk of his affection.[3] These young neophytes, who, for the most part, had been drawn to Bec by the hope of living there with Anselm,[4] gave him his liberty only after hot discussions, and by a very small majority.[5]

To render the noble old man's trial more complete, and to show that there is nothing so pure in the depths of a Christian heart but that a mean jealousy will try to calumniate it, a report was spread in France that Anselm's resistance was only feigned, and that in reality he, like so many others, had always coveted the primacy of England. Anselm recalled his energy to repel this imputation;[6] for he regarded it as a duty to defend the honour of a bishop, called upon to serve as an example to other men.[7] He still, indeed, cherished some hope of being delivered from the burden laid upon him. The king had recovered, and immediately forgetting all his promises, had caused all accused persons or prisoners who remained in England to be again seized, and recommenced, with double cruelty, all previous

[1] See his letter in EADM., p. 36. It ends thus, "*Valete, viscera mea.*"

[2] "Quia nihil in hoc mundo purius dilexi nec diligo."—Ep. iii. 9.

[3] "Dulcissimos filios ante tempus ablactatos (meos adolescentes dico)."—Ep. iii. 21. See also Ep. iii. 22; and the charming letter addressed to these young men, Ep. iii. 17.

[4] "Multa propter me, et fere omnes Beccum venistis."—Ep. iii. 7.

[5] From their letter, Ep. iii. 6, it was not even sure that this majority would have been gained.

[6] Ep. iii. 1, 7, 9, 10, and 11.

[7] "Multum enim nocet infirmis in Ecclesia Dei opinio alicujus vitii, sive vera, sive falsa sit, de aliquo homine : et maxime de eo qui sic est in Ecclesia Catholica constitutus, ut et verbo et exemplo vitæ aliis debeat et possit prodesse."—Ep. iii. 12.

lawsuits and prosecutions.[1] In vain Anselm's friend, Gondulphus, the former monk of Bec, and now Bishop of Rochester, tried by multiplied exhortations to recall his sovereign to God. "By the Holy Face of Lucca!" replied William, "God has done me too much evil ever to get any good from me!"[2]

Anselm went to seek the prince at Dover, and demanded of him, as a *sine qua non*, before his acceptance, that the property of the See of Canterbury, formerly possessed by Lanfranc, and now claimed by himself, should be immediately restored; he asserted, moreover, the right of exercising his archiepiscopal authority in all religious affairs.[3] and finally, full liberty in his relations with Pope Urban II., whom he had hastened to recognise, and to whom he wished, on all occasions, to testify his obedience.[4]

The king having made Anselm an incomplete and equivocal answer, the holy man hoped that he was about to be released from a burden which he feared; and as he had already sent back his abbot's crosier to Bec, requesting that his successor might be chosen as soon as possible,[5] he flattered himself that he should be able to pass the rest of his life in monastic poverty and obedience, without charge of souls, and safe from those spiritual dangers against which he did not think himself strong enough to struggle.[6] But after six

[1] EADM., p. 37.

[2] "Scias, o episcope, quod per sanctum vultum de Luca, nunquam me Deus bonum habebit pro malo quod mihi intulerit."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Volo ut in iis quæ ad Deum et Christianitatem pertinent te meo præ cæteris consilio credas, et sicut ego te volo terrenum habere Dominum et defensorem, ita et tu me spiritualem habeas patrem et animæ tuæ provisorem."

[4] "De Urbano pontifice quem hucusque non recepisti, et ego jam recepi atque recipio, eique debitam obedientiam et subjectionem exhibere volo, cautum te facio ne quod scandalum inde oriatur in futuro."—EADM., *loc. cit.* See also the letter from Anselm to the Legate Hugh.—Ep. iii. 24.

[5] This successor was William, of the seigneurial house of Montfort-sur-Rille, and nephew of Count Roger de Beaumont.

[6] "Libentius eligerem sub abbate in monachica paupertate et humilitate obedire . . . quam regnare sæculariter . . . aut archiepiscopatum

months of resistance and uncertainty, the king, driven to it by the remonstrances of all good Catholics,[1] decided to agree to Anselm's requirements; and the latter did homage to William, as his predecessor had done, on taking possession of the See of Canterbury.[2] He was consecrated December 4, 1093, by Wulstan of Worcester, the last bishop and the last saint of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and the same whose heroic resistance to Lanfranc and to William we have elsewhere related.

Meantime the grief of Anselm was not lessened: for a long time he headed his letters—"Brother Anselm, monk of Bec by choice, Archbishop of Canterbury by violence."[3]

"When you write for me alone," he said to his former companions, "do not write too small; for I have wept so much, night and day, that my eyes can scarcely see to read."[4]

In vain the good old man had tried to calm his anxieties by taking up again his beloved metaphysical studies, and defending Lanfranc's reputation and his own against the imputations of Roscelin the sophist, who endeavoured to make them accountable for his errors with regard to the Trinity.[5] The storm, which he had too well foreseen, was not long in bursting. William needed money for his war with his brother Robert. Anselm, in spite of the poverty of his flock, and the disorder in which he had found the Church property, willingly offered a present of five hundred pounds in silver.

. . . vel abbatiam, aut hominibus quibuslibet præesse ad animarum gubernationem . . . quod ego ipse non imputo mihi tantum ad virtutem, quantum ad hoc quia talem me scio tam parum fortem, parum strenuum . . . ut potius mihi congruat . . . servire quam dominari."—Ep. iii. 11.

[1] "Cum . . . clamorem omnium, de Ecclesiarum destructione conquerentium, Rex amplius ferre nequiret."—EADM., *loc. cit.*

[2] Sept. 25, 1093. He was consecrated Dec. 4th of the same year.

[3] "Professione et corde Beccensis. . . . Voluntate Beccensis monachus, necessitate vocatus Cant. Archiep."—Ep. iii. 26, 39.

[4] "Non nimis gracilis sit scriptura . . . multæ diurnæ et nocturnæ lacrymæ. . . ."—Ep. iii. 15.

[5] See his *Liber de Fide Trinitatis*, and *De Incarnatione verbi contra blasphemias Ruzelini*, cap. i., cf. Ep. ii. 35, 41. He then began the treatise *Cur Deus homo.*

But greedy courtiers persuaded the king that the sum was too small; that the first prelate of the kingdom ought to give at least a thousand, or perhaps two thousand pounds, and that, to frighten and shame the archbishop, it would be proper to send him back his money—which was done. Anselm, indignant, went to the king, and represented to him that it was a hundred times better to obtain a little money willingly than to extort a great deal by violence; and added, that though, out of friendship and goodwill, he was ready to yield much, yet he would never grant anything to those who attempted to treat him as a vassal of servile condition.[1] "Keep your money and your goods, and go!"[2] cried William, in fury.

The archbishop retired, saying, "Blessed be God, who has saved my reputation. If the king had taken my money, people would have said that I was paying him the price of my bishopric." And, at the same time, he caused the five hundred pounds, which he had intended as a present to William, to be distributed to the poor.[3]

The old monk Wulstan, the last of the Saxon bishops, was still living.[4] This holy prelate, whose steadiness in resisting William the Conqueror we have recounted, must have understood and appreciated Anselm better than any one else. "Your Holiness," he wrote to him, "is placed at the summit of the citadel to protect the holy Church from those whose duty should have been to defend her: fear nothing therefore; let no secular power humble you through fear, nor seduce you by favour; begin vigorously, and finish, by God's help, what you have begun, by restraining oppressors, and delivering our holy mother from their hands."[5]

[1] "Amica nempe libertate me et omnia mea ad utilitatem tuam habere poteris, servili autem conditione nec me nec mea habebis."—EADM., p. 38.

[2] "Sint cum jurgio tua tibi, sufficient mea mihi; vade."

[3] "Præsignatum munus pro redemptione animæ suæ pauperibus Christi dabo, non illi."

[4] He died soon after, Jan. 19, 1095.

[5] "Ne igitur dubibet; non eam sæcularis potentiæ timor humiliet, non

Some time afterwards, the king having gone to Hastings, where he was to embark, all the bishops of England assembled to bless the royal traveller. But the wind remaining contrary, the prince was obliged to wait a whole month in that town. Anselm profited by the occasion to point out to him that, before going to conquer Normandy, he would do well to re-establish religion, now threatened with ruin, in his own kingdom, and to order the resumption of councils which, since his accession, had been forbidden. "I will attend to that when I choose," answered the king—"at my pleasure, and not at yours;" and then added, jestingly, "But what would you talk about in your councils?"[1] Anselm replied that he should occupy himself in trying to suppress the incestuous marriages and unspeakable debauchery which threatened to make of England a second Sodom.[2] "And what will that do for you?" asked the king. "If nothing for me, I hope it will do much for God and for you!" "That is enough," replied William, "I wish to hear no more."[3]

Anselm then changed the conversation, and reminded the king how many abbeys were vacant, where disorder had been introduced among the monks, and how he was compromising his own salvation by not appointing abbots. But William, unable to restrain himself, cried angrily, "What is that to you? Are not these abbeys mine? What! you can do what you like with your domains, and I may not dispose of my abbeys as I please?"[4] "They

favor inclinet, sed . . . opprimentes reprimat, S. Matrem nostram contra tales defendat."—EADM., *loc. cit.*

[1] "Adjecet subsannans: Tu vero in concilio unde loqueris?"

[2] "Nefandissimum Sodomæ scelus . . tota terra non multo post Sodoma fiet."

[3] "Et in hac re quid fieret pro te? . . . Si non pro me, spero fieret pro Deo et te. . . . Sufficit, nolo inde ultra loqueris."

[4] "Quid ad te? Numquid abbatiæ non sunt meæ? Hem, tu quodvis agis de villis tuis, et ego non agam quod volo de abbatiis meis! . . . Dei scimus eas esse, ut sui ministri corde vivant, non quo expeditiones et bella tua inde fiant."

are yours," replied Anselm, "to guard and defend them as their steward—not to invade and ruin them. We know that they are God's, that His ministers may live by them—not that you may make wars by means of them. You have enough domains and revenues for all your needs: give back to the Church what belongs to her." "Never," said the king, "would your predecessor have dared to speak in this manner to my father."

Anselm retired: then, as he wished peace above all things, he sent a message to the king by the bishops, to ask him to give him back his friendship, or at least to explain why he had withdrawn it. William replied, "I do not blame him for anything; but I see no reason why I should receive him into favour."[1] The bishops then advised Anselm to appease the king by giving him immediately the five hundred pounds already offered; and secondly, by promising him the same sum a little later, to be raised among the vassals of the archiepiscopal domains. But at these words the holy man answered indignantly, "God forbid that I should follow such advice! These poor creatures have been but too much plundered since the death of Lanfranc; they are stripped to the skin, and you wish me to rob them of that! You would have me buy the favour of the master, to whom I owe faith and honour, as I would buy a horse or an ass![2] But indeed, as to the £500, I have them no longer. I have already given them to the poor."

This answer having been immediately reported to the king, he charged his courtiers to carry the following words to the archbishop: "I hated him much yesterday, and hate him more to-day; let him know that I

[1] "De nulla re illum inculpo, nec tamen ei gratiam meam, quia non audio quare indulgere volo."

[2] "Absit . . . homines mei . . . deprædati sunt et spoliati et ego . . . jam eos nudos spoliarem, imo spoliatos excoriarem. . . . Fidem ei debeo et honorem, et ego illi hoc dedecus facerem, scilicet gratiam suam quasi equum vel asinum vilibus nummulis emerem!"

shall hate him always more and more bitterly for the future."[1]

On the king's return, Anselm visited him at the Tower to tell him that he intended going to Rome to beg the pallium from the pope.[2] "What pope?"[3] asked William, alluding to the anti-pope Guibert, who called himself Clement III. And when Anselm replied, "To Urban II.," the king angrily said that he had not acknowledged Urban, and that to accept him as pope under these circumstances would be very like abdicating.

In vain did Anselm recall the conditions on which he had accepted the archbishopric, and which had been formally agreed to by the king. William, more and more irritated, declared that the archbishop could not at once be faithful to him and obedient to the Holy See against his will.[4] Anselm then proposed to submit the question to the bishops, abbots, and barons of the kingdom assembled in Parliament. Parliament met at Rockingham Castle.[5] There, not in presence of the king, but before a numerous assembly of monks, clergy, and nobles, Anselm explained the state of things to the prelates and lay peers.[6] He related to them all that had passed between the king and himself; he earnestly prayed the bishops to show him how he could best do his duty both to the pope and the King of England. After some hesitation, the bishops advised him to submit simply and entirely to the royal will, declaring that he must not depend at all upon them, since they could not help him in any way if he persisted in

[1] "Heri magno, et hodie illum majori odio habeo, et sciat revera quod cras et deinceps acriori et acerbiori odio semper habebo."

[2] He explains the motives of this resolution and of his whole conduct in his letter to the legate Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons.—Ep. iii. 24.

[3] "A quo Papa illud requirere cupis?"—EADM., p. 40.

[4] "Protestatus est illum nequaquam fidem quam sibi debebat simul et apostolicæ sedis obedientiam, contra suam voluntatem posse servare."

[5] Mid-Lent, Sunday, March 11, 1195.

[6] "Eos et assistentem monachorum, clericorum, laicorum numerosam multitudinem alloquitur."

opposing the king.[1] This said, they bowed, as if to take leave of Anselm, who, raising his eyes to heaven, answered with emotion,[2] "Since you, the pastors and directors of Christian people, refuse me advice, I, who am your chief, however much it may be contested, will have recourse to the head Pastor and Prince of all, to the Angel of great counsel; and I will follow the advice that He gives me, in an affair which is at once His and that of His Church.[3] It was said to St. Peter, '*Thou art Peter; . . . all that thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven*,' &c. And to all the apostles in common, '*He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me.*' No one can doubt that this was said also to the vicar of St. Peter, and to the bishops, vicars of the apostles; but Jesus Christ has not said these things to any emperor, king, duke, or earl. He has Himself taught us our duty towards the earthly powers by saying, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's.' Now I will not depart from these counsels given by God Himself; and I declare to you that, in all that relates to God I will obey the vicar of St. Peter, and in all that is temporal I will serve my lord the king faithfully and with all my power."

These words excited great emotion in the assembly; and as no one dared repeat them to the king, Anselm undertook to do so himself. The king, exasperated, passed the whole day deliberating with his courtiers on the best way of confounding the primate. Dividing into little groups, nobles and clergy consulted among themselves how to

[1] "Si autem secundum Deum quod ullatenus voluntati Regis obviare possit, consilium a nobis expectas, frustra niteris: quia in hujusmodi nunquam tibi nos adminiculari videbis."

[2] "Conticuerunt et capita sua quasi ad ea quæ ipse illaturus erat dimiserunt. . . . Anselmus erectis in altum luminibus vivido vultu. . . ."

[3] "Cum vos qui christianæ plebis pastores . . . ego ad summum pastorem et principem omnium, ego ad magni consilii angelum curram, et in meo, scilicet in suo et Ecclesiæ suæ, negotio consilium quod sequar ab eo accipiam. . . ."

appease the king without too great a departure from the divine law.

Anselm went into the Church alone, calm, strong in his innocence, and full of confidence in God. Fatigued with these interminable struggles, he rested his head against the wall, and fell into a peaceful sleep.[1] The bishops, accompanied by several barons, came to wake him, and again began to preach submission. "Reflect well," they said to him, "on the gravity of your situation, and give up your obedience to Pope Urban, who can neither serve you if the king is angry, nor hurt you if the king is favourable. Shake off this yoke and remain free, as befits an Archbishop of Canterbury, until you receive the king's commands."[2]

William, Bishop of Durham, was the most eager of all; he had made sure, while with the king, of either bringing Anselm to dishonour himself by a shameful submission,[3] or to lay down his dignity. He insisted, therefore, that the archbishop should answer immediately, lest, as he said, he should be condemned as guilty of lese-majesty.[4] And all the others added, "Do not imagine this to be a light matter."

The archbishop answered, "If any one can prove that I have broken my oath to the king, because I will not fail in the obedience due to the Roman pontiff, let him show himself, and I will be ready to answer him as I ought, and where I ought." The bishops looked at each other in

[1] "Rex vehementer iratus . . . hic duo, ibi tres, illic quatuor in unum consiliabantur . . . solus inter hæc Anselmus sedebat innocentia cordis sui, et in misericordia Dei fiduciam habens. . . . Ipse ad parietem se reclinans, leni somno quiescebat."

[2] "Urbani illius qui, offenso Domino rege, nihil tibi prodesse, nec ipso placato obesse valet, obedientiam abjice . . . liber, ut arch. Cantuar. decet. . . . Domini Regis jussionem exspecta."

[3] "Rex applaudebat sibi, sperans illum vel abjurato apostolico infamem remanere in regno suo."

[4] "Jam nunc a vestigio ad Domini nostri dicta responde, aut sententiam tuæ vindicem præsumptionis dubio procul in præsenti experiere. Nec jocum existimes esse quod agitur."

silence, for they knew well that the archbishop could only be judged by the pope.

Meanwhile those present grew indignant at the sight of such unfair dealing, and murmurs began to be heard. Then a knight, issuing from the crowd, knelt before Anselm and said,—"My lord and father, your children entreat you, by my mouth, not to be troubled by what has just been said, but to remember the blessed Job, who, on his dunghill, vanquished the demon that overcame Adam in Paradise."[1]

These noble words, from the heart of a soldier, were to the holy confessor an unexpected consolation and a pledge of popular sympathy.[2] Night closed the debate; but it recommenced next morning. The king seemed as much exasperated against his bishops, who, he said, accomplished nothing, as against the archbishop, who could not be moved. Then William of Durham proposed to depose Anselm, and banish him from the kingdom; but the barons rejected this idea. The king, annoyed, asked, "If that does not please you, what will? As long as I live, I will have no rival in my kingdom. Now talk among yourselves as you like; but by the face of God, if you do not condemn this man at my bidding, I will condemn you."[3]

One of the prince's favourites, named Robert, said, "But what can we do with a man who goes to sleep quietly while we are exhausting ourselves in discussion, and who, with one word, destroys all our objections as if they were cobwebs?"[4]

[1] "Miles unus de multitudine prodiens. . . . Memor esto beati Job vincentis Diabolum in sterquilinio, et vindicantis Adam quem vicerat in Paradiso."

[2] "Intellexit animum populi in sua secum sententia esse. Gavisi ergo exinde sumus et animæquiores facti." It is evident that Eadmer, the narrator of all these scenes, was an eyewitness of them.

[3] "Ite, ite, consiliamini, quia per vultum Dei, si vos illum ad meam voluntatem non damnaveritis, ego damnabo vos."

[4] "Cum omni studio per totum diem inter nos illa conferimus . . . dormit et prolate coram eo statim uno labiorum suorum pulsu quasi telas araneæ rumpit."

After long arguments, which ended by proving the impossibility of trying a primate of England, the king ordered the bishops to break off all relations with him, and all ties of obedience to him, declaring that he himself, as sovereign, would refuse to the metropolitan all confidence, all peace, and all safety.[1] The bishops again consented to carry this notification to the archbishop, who replied—

"Your conduct seems to me wrong, but I will not return evil for evil. I regard you all as my brothers, as children of the church of Canterbury, and I will endeavour to bring you back to the right way. As to the king, I am ready to do him all the service I can, and to render him abundantly, when he wishes it, the most fatherly care; but I will not abdicate the dignity and authority of my episcopate."

After this, the king tried to obtain from the lay peers, as well as from the bishops, a promise to renounce all relations with Anselm. But the barons refused to imitate the cowardice of the prelates. "We have never," they said, "been vassals to the archbishops, and we cannot abjure an oath we never took: but Anselm is our metropolitan; it is his business to guide the religious affairs of this country; and therefore we, who are Christians, cannot withdraw from his authority, especially as his conduct is without a stain."[2]

The king feared to irritate his baronage by insisting. As to the bishops, their confusion was unbounded. They were the objects of universal indignation; each received an insulting nickname—one Judas the traitor, another Pilate, a third Herod.[3] At last, all the discussions having led to

[1] "En ego primum in imperio meo penitus ei omnem securitatem et fiduciam mei tollo," &c.

[2] "Nos nunquam homines ejus fuimus . . . Archiepiscopus noster est. Christianitatem in hac terra gubernare habet, et ea re, nos qui Christiani sumus ejus magisterium dum hic vivimus declinare non possumus, præsertim," &c.

[3] "Audires . . . nunc ab isto nunc ab illo istum vel illum episcopum aliquo cognomine cum interjectione indignantis designari, videlicet Judæ proditoris," &c. Eadmer adds, that the king having questioned the bishops one by one as to their renunciation of Anselm's authority, there were some

nothing, it was agreed to put off the final decision till Pentecost, all things remaining as they were until that time.

This situation was far from consoling to Anselm, who had been obliged to return to Canterbury, where he saw, according to custom, the most odious treatment inflicted on the Church vassals, such, indeed, as drove them to curse the heroic resistance of their pastor.[1] The king drove into banishment Baldwin the monk, the intimate friend and counsellor of the archbishop, and the person who took charge of all those secular affairs the care of which was intolerable to him. This was to wound the prelate in the tenderest part of his nature,[2] for amidst all his trials he found support and consolation nowhere except among his old friends of the cloister. Of all the English bishops since the death of the Saxon Wulstan, there was but one who had not basely betrayed the archbishop,[3] and that was Gondulphus, Bishop of Rochester, whom we have seen so tenderly attached to him while they were both monks at Bec. Anselm could only breathe freely when he was able to shut himself up in the cloister of the Canterbury monks, and preside at their services.

"I am like the owl," he said to them: "when he is in his hole with his little ones, he is happy; but when he goes out among crows and other birds, they pursue him and strike

who replied that they did not renounce it absolutely and without reserve, but only so far as he claimed to exercise this authority over them in virtue of his submission to the pope. These were disgraced, and obliged to buy back the royal favour by a bribe.

[1] "Crudeles suorum hominum oppressiones quotidie auribus ejus insonantes. . . ."—EADM., 14. "Passa est Ecclesia Cantuar. tam sævam tempestatem, ut fere universi conclamarent melius sibi absque pastore jam olim fuisse, quam nunc sub hujusmodi pastore esse."—*Id.*, 43; see, further, p. 85.

[2] "Rex Anselmum hoc facto atroci mœroris verbere perculit."—*Ibid.*

[3] EADMER says expressly, "Rofenso solo excepto," p. 7. But WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *de Gest. Pontif.*, ii. p. 257, points out also Bishop Ralph of Chichester, "*qui contuitu sacerdotalis officii Wilhelmo in faciem pro Anselmo restitit.*"

him with their beaks, and he is ill at ease."[1] Often the holy old man wept when he thought of the danger to his soul in these perpetual combats, and cried, "Oh how much rather would I be schoolmaster in a monastery than primate of England!" His enemies, as well as his best friends, reproached him with his excessive love of retirement; they said that he was better fitted to live shut up in a convent than to fill the office of primate[2] of a great nation. Anselm himself was more convinced of this than any one;[3] but God knew and judged him better than his critics.

Meanwhile King William had secretly sent two clerks of his chapel to Rome, to find out which pope he ought to acknowledge, and beg him to send the pallium, not to Anselm, but to the king himself, who would give it to some archbishop. These envoys perceived that Urban was the true pope, and persuaded him to send to England as legate, Walter, Bishop of Albano, who brought the pallium. This prelate's conduct was equivocal, for he passed through Canterbury without even seeing Anselm, and took no steps in favour of the persecuted primate.[4] A report was spread that he had promised the king that in future no legate should come to England without his order, and that no one should be allowed to receive letters from the pope unknown to him.[5] This report caused many murmurs, and it was said, "If Rome prefers gold and silver to justice, what hope remains for the oppressed who have nothing to give?"[6]

[1] "Sicut bubo, dum in caverna cum pullis suis est, lætatur, et suo sibi modo bene est; dum vero inter corvos . . . omnino quoque sibi male est; ita et mihi."—EADM., 14.

[2] "Pro ipsarum indiscreta, cui nonnullis et mihi aliquando visum est, virtutum custodia sæpe reprehensus, et quod monachus claustralis quam primas tantæ gentis esse deberet."—*Id.*, 15.

[3] "In loco humili aliquid agere videbar: in sublimi positus . . . nec mihi fructum facio, nec utilis alicui existo."—*Lettre au pape*, Ep. iii. 37.

[4] See Anselm's very severe letter to the legate.—Ep. iii. 36.

[5] MABILL., *Ann.*, b. 69, No. 27.

[6] "Papæ, inquiunt, quid dicemus? Si aurum et argentum Roma præ-

When the king had acknowledged Urban, however, the legate absolutely refused to depose Anselm, in spite of the large sums William promised to pay if he might obtain what he desired.[1]

Meanwhile, as Pentecost approached, the king tried to extort money at least from the inflexible prelate; bishops proposed to him to pay the prince the sum which a journey to Rome, to receive the pallium, would cost him.[2] The archbishop indignantly refused. William was exasperated; but, by the advice of the barons, he finally yielded—he acknowledged Anselm as archbishop, and allowed him to take the pallium from the altar of the metropolitan church.[3]

The peace thus concluded could be only a truce. Anselm felt this; and the feeling is evident in the letter which he wrote to the pope to thank him for the pallium, and excuse himself for not having yet gone to Rome. "Holy father," he said, "I regret being what I am, and no longer being what I was. I regret being a bishop, because my sins will not let me do all a bishop's duties. I bend under my burden, for I am wanting in strength, science, skill, and all needful qualities. I should like to fly from this insupportable load; the fear of God alone detains me. Feed my misery with the alms of your prayers, I implore you; if my shipwreck is complete, and the storm forces me to take refuge in the bosom of the mother Church, for love of Him who gave His blood for us, let me find in you an asylum and a consolation."[4]

ponit justitiæ, . . . quid solaminis ibi deinceps in sua oppressione reperient, qui," &c.—EADM., 44.

[1] "Spondens immensum pecuniæ pondus ei et Ecclesiæ romanæ singulis annis daturum."

[2] "Laudamus et consulimus ut saltem quod in via expenderes si pro hoc Romam ires, Regi des."

[3] Some days before this ceremony, the Bishops of Salisbury and Hereford came to ask pardon of him for having, with the other prelates, abandoned him at Rockingham. He gave them absolution "*in quadam ecclesiola quæ se nobis obtulit ambulantibus proposita via.*"—EADM., 45.

[4] "Sancte Pater, doleo me esse quod sum, doleo me non esse quod fui.

But at the end of a few months the war broke out afresh.

In 1096, Robert, wishing to go to the crusade, had yielded possession of Normandy for three years to his brother William, receiving 10,000 marks of silver for it.[1] To procure this money the king, according to his usual custom, began to pillage the English churches.[2] Anselm gave, as his share, 200 marks. Afterwards the king undertook an expedition against the Welsh. Anselm sent the soldiers it was his duty to furnish; but the king found them ill trained and ill equipped, and sent him word that he should be cited before his Court to answer for his negligence. Each day there was some new vexation, some requirement contrary to the law of God.[3] The kingdom was more and more desolated by the corruption of morals and the spoliation of churches and abbeys. Anselm resolved to go to the pope, and consult him as to what he should do for the safety of his soul.[4] He took care to make his project known to the king, who was holding his Court at Windsor, and sent to ask his permission to leave the kingdom. William refused it, saying, "He has done nothing that needs absolution from the pope, and he is much fitter to advise the holy father than to be advised by him."[5] Anselm was returning from Windsor to one of his own estates after this refusal, when a hare, pursued by hunters, took refuge between the legs of his horse. The archbishop stopped the dogs, and seeing everybody laugh, he shed tears, saying, "Do you laugh?

. . . Oneri cuidam succumbo . . . errabundus suspiro . . . in naufragio positus, si quando procellis irruentibus . . . ad sinum matris Ecclesiæ confugero."—Ep. iii. 37.

[1] GUILL. GEMETIC., viii. 7.

[2] "Nihil Ecclesiarum ornamentis indulsit, nihil sacris altarium vasis, nihil reliquiarum capsis, nihil Evangeliorum libris auro vel argento paratis."—EADM., 45.

[3] Letter of Anselm to Pascal II.—Ep. iii. 40.

[4] "Ut inde consilium de anima mea et de officio mihi injuncto acciperem."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Magis illum sciamus apostolico quam apostolicum sibi in dando consilio posse succurrere."

This poor creature is far from laughter; she is like the Christian soul ceaselessly pursued by demons who would drag her to eternal death. Poor tortured soul, that looks anxiously round and seeks with ineffable desire the hand that can save!" And he immediately ordered the poor animal to be let go in safety.[1]

Anselm twice renewed his request to leave England; the last time was at a council held at Winchester, October 1097. The king impatiently declared that if the primate went to Rome he would appropriate to himself all the property of the church of Canterbury, which should cease to have an archbishop. Anselm replied that he would rather obey God than man;[2] and calling out of the king's council the four bishops who were present there, he said to them, privately, "My brothers, you are bishops, and heads of the Church of God. Promise me, therefore, to uphold in my interest the rights of God and of justice with as much care and fidelity as you would use respecting the rights and customs of a mortal man in the interest of your neighbour. Then I will tell you, as my sons and faithful servants of God, what my purpose is, and I will follow the advice which your trust in God shall give me."[3] They retired to confer

[1] "Solutus in lacrymis ait: Ridetis? Et utique infelici huic nullus risus . . . hoc plane est et animæ hominis . . . nimis anxia huc illucque circumspicit, et qua tueatur manum sibi porrigi ineffabili desiderio concupiscit."—EADM., 17. This anecdote illustrates two different traits of Anselm's character—his excessive kindness, and his fondness for drawing spiritual analogies from ordinary incidents. Eadmer relates other circumstances of the same kind, such as the story of the bird fastened by a string, and held by a child; and that of his care for his guests, who ate comfortably while he patiently waited for them: "*affabili vultus jucunditate super eos aspiciebat et adgaudens, levata modicum dextra, benedicebat eis dicens: Benefaciat vobis*," p. 15.

[2] "Occurrit animo episcopos æquius esse in suo quod erat Dei quam in consilio regis terreni." They were the Bishops of Winchester, Lincoln, Salisbury, and Bath.

[3] "Si ita fideliter et distincte vultis in mea parte considerare atque tueri rectitudinem et justitiam Dei, sicut in parte alterius perpenditis atque tuemini jura et usus mortalis hominis. . . ."

upon what they should answer, and at the same time sent one of their number to the king to ask his instructions. Having received them, they came back to the archbishop, and spoke thus: "We know that you are a holy and religious man, entirely occupied with heavenly things. But we, bound to the world by our relations, whom we maintain, and by many terrestrial objects of our love, cannot rise to your height and disdain this world as you do. If, then, you will place yourself on our level, and travel the same road with us, we will care for your interests as our own. But if you have resolved to think only of God, as in the past, you must do without us; for we cannot be wanting in fidelity to our king."[1]

"Very well," replied Anselm, "return to your master; I will depend solely on God."[2] And he remained alone, with only a few monks, among whom was Eadmer, who has given us all these details. It was destined that, in this memorable history, the inviolable character of the episcopate should be raised to the highest majesty by Anselm, and dragged in the mud by his brethren. The latter, in fact, soon came back to him and said, "The king sends you word that you have broken your oath to observe the laws and customs of the kingdom, by threatening to go to Rome without his permission; he requires, therefore, either that you should swear never to appeal, for any cause whatever, to the Holy See, or that you should immediately leave his dominions." Anselm went himself to carry his answer to the king.[3] "I acknowledge," he said, "that I have sworn to observe your usages and customs, but such only as are agreeable to God and the right."

[1] "Fatemur, ad sublimitatem vitæ tuæ surgere nequimus, nec huic mundo tecum illudere. Sed si volueris ad nos usque descendere . . . si vero te ad Deum solummodo . . . tenere delegeris, solus quantum nostri interest, in hoc, ut hactenus fuisti, et amodo eris."

[2] "Bene dixistis. Ite ergo ad dominum vestrum: ego me tenebo ad Deum."

[3] "Ad regem nobiscum sequentibus ingressus, dextram illus ex more assedit."—EADM., 48.

The king and barons objected to this, swearing that there was no question either of God or of the right. "How!" replied the archbishop; "if there is no question of God or the right, what is there question of?[1] God forbid that any Christian should observe laws and customs opposed to God and the right. You say that it is contrary to the customs of your kingdom that I should go to consult the Vicar of St. Peter as to the safety of my soul and the government of my church, and I declare that such a custom is opposed to God and the right, and that every servant of God ought to contemn it.[2] All human faith has for its guarantee the faith due to God.[3] What would you say, O king, if one of your rich and powerful vassals should try to prevent one of his from rendering you the service he owes you?" "Oh, oh," interrupted the king and the Count of Meulan, "he is preaching us a sermon now; there is no use in listening to what he says."[4]

The nobles tried to stifle his voice by their outcries. He waited without impatience till they had wearied themselves, and then went on—

"You would have me swear never again to appeal to the Vicar of Peter. To swear this would be to deny St. Peter; to deny St. Peter is to abjure Christ; and to abjure Christ for fear of you would be a crime from which the judgment of your Court could not absolve me."[5] This calmness and courage prevailed. The king suffered Anselm to depart.

The archbishop, when leaving William, said to him, "I do not know when I shall see you again. I shall never cease

[1] "Papæ! si nec Dei nec rectitudinis mentio ut dicitis, facta fuit, cujus tunc?"

[2] "Et ideo ab omni servo Dei spernendam profiteor ac refutandam."

[3] "Omnis fides quæ cuivis homini legaliter promittitur, ex fide Dei roboratur. Sic enim spondet homo homini. Per fidem quam debeo Deo, fidelis tibi ero. . . . Ergo liquet quod eadem fides si quando contraria fidei Dei admittit, enervetur."

[4] "O, o, prædicatio est quod dicit, prædicatio est: non rei de qua agitur ulla, quæ recipienda sit a prudentibus ratio."

[5] "Peccatum . . . judicio curiæ tuæ non segnis emendabo."

to desire your salvation, as a spiritual father desires that of his beloved son. As Archbishop of Canterbury I would give to the King of England God's blessing and mine—at least if he does not refuse it."

"No," said the king, "I do not refuse it." And he humbly bent his head to receive this benediction.[1]

[1] "Signum S. Crucis super regem ad hoc caput humiliantem edidit et abscessit."—EADMER, 49.

CHAPTER VI

DISTINCTION OF THE TWO POWERS

Anselm attacked by the Duke of Burgundy.—He is venerated throughout Christendom.—Pope Urban II. forbids Anselm to renounce his see.—Anselm intercedes with the pope in favour of the King of England.—Council at Rome, and speech of Reinger, Bishop of Lucca.—Severe words of the pope as to lay investitures.—Margaret of Scotland strengthens Christianity there.—Martyrdom of St. Canute in Denmark.—Scandal at the Court of the French king.—Yves of Chartres fulminates against the Archbishop of Tours.—Assault and capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders.—Death of Pope Urban II.—Accession of Pascal II.—The three adversaries of William Rufus.—His violence towards Hildebert, Bishop of Mans.—Tragic death of William Rufus.—Anselm returns to England, where he does not find peace.—The King of England, in prosperity, forgets his promises.—Threats addressed to the pope by the King of England.—Machiavelism of Henry of England's ambassadors at Rome.—Admirable conduct of Bishop Giffard.—Anselm leaves England for Rome.—He stops at Lyons with Archbishop Hugh.—Anselm's tender care for his flock.—His exhortations to Queen Matilda of England.—Anselm's answer to the king's letters.—Anselm refuses to return to England.—Return of the primate after three years of exile.—The king declares that no one in his kingdom shall receive investiture by the crosier and ring from the hands of a layman.—Anselm's long resistance to royal despotism is a glory for the Church.—Bishop Gondulphus of Rochester dies before Anselm.—Frequent illness of the archbishop.—His death and his glory.

ANSELM immediately started for Canterbury, where, assembling his beloved monks about him, he endeavoured to console them for his departure by holding before their eyes the hope that his journey would be of use to the future liberty of the Church.[1] After a touching farewell address, in which he compared the religious life to temporal knighthood, Anselm

[1] "Sperans in respectum misericordis Dei iter meum libertati Ecclesiæ futuris temporibus non nihil profuturum."—EADM., 18.

gave to each one the kiss of peace. He then took from the altar his pilgrim's staff and scrip, and went to Dover to embark. There a new insult awaited him. A clerk named William stopped him on the shore, and in the king's name caused the archbishop's baggage to be searched to make sure that it contained no money. None was found; and the royal revenue gained nothing but the maledictions of the indignant crowd.[1] The king indemnified himself by immediately seizing all the domains of the archbishopric, which were cultivated for his benefit.[2]

Scarcely had Anselm set foot upon the soil of France, when the popular enthusiasm declared itself. This was the first reward of his fidelity to God and the Church; it was also for historians an incontestable proof of the powerful sympathy which then animated all Christian nations, and which, in spite of the restricted publicity of the period, united them in one body to share the joys or trials of their common mother—the holy Catholic Church. Men and women, rich and poor, hastened to meet the pontiff-confessor, the voluntary exile, whose fame had preceded him. Wherever he came, the clergy, the monks, and the people gathered round him with flying banners, the music of canticles, and all the marks of excessive joy.[3] He already

[1] "In littore detinuit. . . . Allatæ ante illum bulgiæ et manticæ reseratæ, et tota supellex illius subversa et exquisita, ingenti plebis multitudine circumstante ac nefarium opus, pro sui novitate . . . execrante."

[2] Would the reader like to know how the philosophers of our day judge of this conflict? Let him hear M. Franck, who, in the work already quoted, thinks himself obliged to excuse Anselm for his revolt against the king; for this is what Protestants and rationalists call a revolt. He says that this revolt was less the fault of Anselm personally than of the age, and that, like all such *tragic collisions*, it must not be judged by the *laws of ordinary morality*—DIE GEWOHNLICHE MORALISCHE MAASTAB REICHT HIER NICHT AUS, p. 73. There is always among these doctors of liberty and equality this same claim to create, for great men and great events, an exceptional morality—a theory which confounds both the doctrines and conduct of the great men of Catholicism.

[3] "Videres ergo viros et mulieres, magnos et parvos, a domibus ruere certatimque currendo. . . . Fama viri celerius præcurrebat et multiplici

exercised all the ascendancy of holiness; some he attracted and some he dominated. When he arrived in Burgundy, the duke of that province, tempted by the rich prey offered in the person of a primate of England travelling to Rome, hurried to intercept the pilgrims and pillage them. But there was in those days, even in hearts most swayed by greed, a door always open to the light of religion. When the duke, galloping up, had reached the travellers, he shouted loudly, "Which of you is the archbishop?" But scarcely had he looked at Anselm than he grew red, lowered his eyes, stammered some words incoherently, and then was silent. The archbishop, as if he suspected nothing, offered the kiss of peace to the duke, who accepted it, recommending himself humbly to the prelate's prayers, and saying, as he retired, "I have seen the face of an angel from heaven, and not of a man."[1] The seared conscience of the warrior had been touched by a ray of grace; he became a crusader, died gloriously in defending the tomb of Christ, and his body, brought back to the monks of Citeaux, was buried under the porch of their church, where the steps of St. Bernard, his brethren, and others of the faithful, through many years passed over its resting-place.[2]

Anselm, pursuing his journey, arrived at Cluny, where the holy Abbot Hugh and his army of monks[3] received him with delight. He there spent Christmas (1097), and then went to Lyons, to await at the house of his friend the

populos voce replebat. Unde turbarum concursus, clericorum cœtus, monachorum exercitus, isti gaudio et exultatione concrepantes, illi vexillis et sonoris concentibus conjubilantes."—EADM., 19, 49.

[1] "In equis ocior advolat et clamore valido quis vel ubi esset archiepiscopus interrogat. Quem . . . intuitus subito pudore percussus, erubuit demisso vultu, et quid diceret non invenit. Cui Pater: Domine Dux, si placet, osculabor te. . . . Nec enim hominis sed vultus angeli Dei fulget in eo."—EADM., 49.

[2] This duke was Eudes, surnamed Borel, who reigned from 1078 to 1102, and contributed to the foundation of Citeaux in 1089, the year which followed Anselm's journey through his States.

[3] "Toto illius monasterii monachorum agmine."

Cardinal-Archbishop Hugh an answer to a letter which he had written to the pope—first, to point out the incompatibility of his position in England with the exercise of episcopal liberty; and, secondly, to obtain permission to lay down the burden which weighed upon him, and to serve God in freedom.[1]

Urban wrote to Anselm to come to him without delay. The archbishop started immediately, in spite of illness and of the dangers of the road,[2] which were then great.

The cause of William Rufus was almost the same as that of the Emperor Henry IV. For this reason the Italian partisans of the latter, as well as those of the anti-pope, waited for the passing of the bishops and orthodox monks, with the intention of pillaging, outraging, and even killing them.[3] On hearing of the approach of the archbishop, whom they supposed loaded with riches, the greed of the schismatics was excited, and the road which the venerable traveller was to follow was closely watched. But Anselm disconcerted all their plans by travelling like a simple monk, accompanied only by two other monks—his friend Baldwin and his biographer Eadmer. The primate received hospitality in the monasteries on his way,[4] without making himself known. Often the monks, his hosts, spoke to him of the Archbishop of Canterbury and his expected journey.[5] At Aspera they told him that the primate had reached

[1] "Videbam enim multa mala in terra illa quæ nec tolerare debebam, nec episcopali libertate corrigere poteram . . . ut animam meam de vinculo tantæ servitutis absolvatis, eique libertatem serviendi Deo in tranquillitate reddatis."—Ep. iii. 166.

[2] "Viæ se periculis, mortem pro Deo non veritus, tradit."—EADM., 50. The Tuesday before Palm Sunday, 16th March 1098.

[3] "Maxime homines Alemannici regis intendebant, ob dissentionem quæ fuerat illis diebus inter Papam et ipsum."

[4] "Visum Patri est decentius inter monachos . . . quam inter villanos, nocte illa conversari, tum propter religionem monachini ordinis, tum propter officium imminentis noctis atque diei."

[5] See the conversation between the travellers and the monks of Aspera, five days' journey from Lyons.—EADM., 51.

Placentia, and there prudently turned back. At Susa, the abbot, hearing that the travellers were monks of Bec, said to them, "Tell me, brothers, I beg you, is that Anselm who used to be your abbot, that great friend of God and of good men, still alive?" "Yes," said Baldwin, "he is alive, but he has been forced to become an archbishop in another country." "I heard so," replied the abbot; "but how is he now?" "They say he is well," answered Baldwin. "Pray God guard him!" added the abbot; "I pray for him day and night."

When such incidents happened, Anselm drew his hood over his head and kept silence.[1] But the soft and steady glance which had vanquished the savage Duke of Burgundy revealed the great servant of God; and in the Italian inns, men and women, after having examined the unknown traveller, knelt before him and asked his blessing.[2]

At Rome, the pope received the primate in the Lateran, surrounded by the Roman nobility; he embraced him amidst the acclamations of the pontifical court;[3] and, addressing those present, he made a magnificent eulogy of the prelate, declaring that he regarded as his master in learning, and almost as his equal in dignity, this patriarch of a distant island,[4] which had banished him for preserving his fidelity to St. Peter.[5] After having listened to Anselm's narrative, the sovereign pontiff wrote a letter to the King

[1] "Fratres, obsecro vos, vivit ille adhuc, ille Dei et omnium bonorum amicus Anselmus . . . et ut valeat oro. Hæc de se Anselmus dici audiens, infestim tecto cuculæ suæ capitio capite, demisso vultu sedebat."—EADM., 20.

[2] "Ecce solus Anselmi aspectus in admirationem sui populos excitabat, eumque esse virum vitæ designabat. . . . Viri cum mulieribus hospitium intrare, et ut hominem videre," &c.

[3] "Mane confluit ad Papam romana nobilitas. . . . Statim ab ipso erigitur ad osculum ejus. . . . Acclamat curia dicto.'

[4] "Quasi comparem vel ut alterius orbis apostolicum et patriarcham jure venerandum."—EADM., 20. "Toto divisos orbe Britannos. . . ."

[5] "Viri propter justitiam necne fidelitatem B. Petri exulantis."—EADM., 51.

of England, in which he desired and even commanded him to repair the evil he had committed.[1]

The archbishop stayed only ten days at the Lateran; the unwholesome air of Rome obliged him to go and wait William's answer at an abbey of Apulia, near Telesia, governed by a former monk of Bec.[2] Built on the summit of a mountain, in a domain called Schlavia, this place pleased Anselm so much that he exclaimed, "Here is my resting-place."[3] Here he at once resumed his old monastic habits and labours, and here he finished a treatise of remarkable power on the motives of the divine Incarnation.[4]

Meantime the Normans, some of whom had been his companions at Bec, did not leave him long undisturbed; Duke Roger, whose troops were besieging Capua, implored the saint to visit him and help him to walk more firmly in the way of salvation. Followed by all his knights, the prince came to meet the prelate, embraced him affectionately, and caused tents to be pitched for him at some distance from the body of the army, and not far from a little church, where, every day, he visited the archbishop and conversed with him.[5]

Pope Urban, on his side, did not delay joining Anselm at the Norman camp. None of those who came to visit the pope failed at the same time to present themselves before the primate, whose humility and gentleness attracted every one, even those travellers whose inferior rank generally kept them at a distance from the pontifical majesty.[6]

[1] "Movet, hortatur, imperat."

[2] John, Abbot of St. Salvator. Telesia is between Benevento and Capua

[3] "Hæc requies mea, hic habitabo."

[4] The treatise entitled *Cur Deus homo*, which he began in England.

[5] "Cupiens . . . per eum his quæ saluti suæ adminiculari poterant informari. . . . Adhuc longe eramus; ecce Dux ipse copiosa militum multitudine septus patri occurrit ac in oscula ruens. . . . Ducem ipsum cum suis nobiscum singulis diebus in promptu habentes."—EADM., 51 and 21.

[6] "Nec facile quivis declinaret ad Papam qui non diverteret ad Anselmum. . . . Mira et quæ cunctos demulcebat pura cum simplicitate

The Saracens, great numbers of whom were serving under Count Roger of Sicily, the duke's uncle, did not escape the charm exercised by the saint's virtues. When he passed through their camp, the infidels kissed his hands, kneeling, and called down the blessings of Heaven upon him.

Meantime William Rufus, far from yielding to the papal injunctions, constantly endeavoured by letters and presents to prejudice against Anselm both the sovereign pontiff and Duke Roger. The Duke was entirely unmoved by this; and to induce the exiled prelate to remain with him, offered gifts of all the best of his possessions both in towns and castles. But the archbishop had no unwillingness to eat the bread of poverty. The last news from England, which informed him of fresh impieties and atrocious cruelties committed by the king, redoubled his wish to renounce the see of Canterbury and the primacy of England, where no one except a few monks would suffer themselves to be influenced by him.[1] He soon confided his design to the pope, who did not approve of it. "O bishop! O pastor!" he said to him, "you have not yet shed your blood, and already you would abandon the care of your flock! Christ tried St. Peter by bidding him feed His sheep; and Anselm—the holy Anselm—that great man, only because he desires rest, would leave the flock of Christ to the teeth of wolves! Not only do I not permit you to resign, but I forbid you to do so, in the name of God and of the blessed St. Peter. If the tyranny of the present king forbids your return to Canterbury, you are none the less archbishop by the Christian law, and clothed with power to bind and to loose as long as you live, and wherever you live. And I, whom

humilitas. Multi ergo quos timor prohibebat ad Papam accedere, festinabant ad Anselmum venire, amore ducti qui nescit timere."

[1] "Quomodo nullus, exceptis aliquibus monachis cum gratia fructificandi Deum audiret." Eadmer tells several infamous stories of William. M. Thierry reproduces one in his *Histoire de la conquête des Normands*, vol. iii. p. 336, where he has not found room for a word about the trials of Anselm and of the Church.

you perhaps accuse of being insensible to your sufferings, I summon you to a council which I will hold at Bari beside the body of St. Nicholas, that I may there consider and weigh what I ought to do to the English king and others like him, insurgents against the liberty of the Church.[1]

This council did assemble on the 1st October 1098. One hundred and eighty-five bishops were present in their copes, under the presidency of the pope, who alone wore the chasuble and pallium. Anselm, whom the sovereign pontiff when taking his seat had forgotten, went, with his usual humility, to place himself among the other prelates.[2] The council began by a discussion with the Greek bishops as to the procession of the Holy Spirit. As the dispute grew warmer, and the question became more and more confused, the pope, who had already used some arguments drawn from Anselm's treatise on the Incarnation, demanded silence, and called loudly, "Our father and master, Anselm, Archbishop of the English, where are you?" Anselm rose and said, "Holy father, I am here." The pope replied, "It is now, my son, that we need your learning and eloquence; come up here—come and defend your mother and ours against the Greeks. It is God who has sent you to our help."[3]

[1] "O Episcopum! o pastorem! nondum cædes, nondum vulnera perpessus es, et jam. . . . Et Anselmus, Anselmus, inquam, ille sanctus, ille talis ac tantus vir, solummodo quiescere volens . . . quod si propter tyrannidem principis, qui nunc ibi dominatur . . . jure tamen Christianitatis semper illius archiepiscopus esto. . . . Ego quoque ne de his . . . videar non curare, eaque gladio S. Petri nolle vindicare, moneo . . . ut quod de ipso rege Anglico suisque ac sui similibus, qui contra libertatem Ecclesiæ Dei se erexerunt, mediante æquitatis censura, me facturum disposui . . . percipias."

[2] "Omnibus ergo suum locum ex antiquo vindicantibus, Anselmus humilitate summus, quo poterat, assedit. Exciderat animo summi Pontificis ingruente tumultu, ut ei locum delegaret."—GUILL. MALMESB *de Gest. Pontif.*, i. 229.

[3] "Pater et magister Anselme, Anglorum archiepiscope, ubi es? Sedebat pater in ordine ceterorum . . . et ego ad pedes ejus. . . . Surrexit continuo et respondit: Domine pater, quid præcipitis! Ecce me."—EADM., 53. Cf. GUILL. MALMESB., *loc. cit.*

Amidst the great disorder produced in the assembly by the change of places, and to the astonishment of those present, who wondered what this old man was, and whence he came, the pope commanded Anselm to seat himself at the foot of the pontifical throne, and declared to the auditory the talents, misfortunes, and virtues of the foreign doctor.[1] Anselm, after this introduction, spoke so clearly and so successfully on the controverted question, that the Greeks were confounded; and the sovereign pontiff pronounced an anathema against all who should not accept the true doctrine as the primate had set it forth.[2]

They then passed to the affairs of the English king. Anselm kept silence, but accusers were not wanting. After the recital of the horrible crimes which William had committed against God and man,[3] the pope added, "Such is this tyrant's life. In vain we have sought to amend him by persuasion. The persecution and exile of the great man now before you may prove how ill we have succeeded. My brothers, what is your decision?"

The bishops replied: "Since you have warned him three times, and he is still disobedient, it only remains to smite him with the sword of St. Peter, that he may live under the weight of the anathema until he amends."[4]

The pope was about to pronounce the excommunication, when Anselm, rising quickly, and kneeling before him, implored him not immediately to pronounce the dreadful sentence. The victim interceded for the executioner. At the

[1] "Videres quosque perstrepere, sedes mutare, locum sedendi viro parare . . . consilio stupente ad hæc et percunctante quis esset et unde."

[2] Anselm himself describes this discussion in a treatise entitled *de processione Spiritus sancti*, copies of which he sent to different countries at the request of his friends. Cf. HILDEBERTI, EP. CENOMAN, Ep. 9, ed. Beaugendre, and EADM., p. 53.

[3] "Proferuntur in medium scelera dictu horrenda, adjicitur contemptui humano cœlestis injuria."—GUILL. MALMESB., *loc. cit.*

[4] "Ecce vita illius tyranni. . . . Restat ut gladio sancti Petri sub anathematis ictu percussus, quod meruit sentiat, donec a sua pravitate decedat."—EADM.

sight of such charity, says William of Malmesbury, the council might well be convinced that Anselm's virtues were even greater than their reputation.[1] After the council the archbishop returned with the pope to Rome, where, a few days later, there arrived as envoy from the King of England that very William who had searched the primate's baggage on the beach at Dover. William said that the king, his master, had acted in this manner because he thought the archbishop had no right to leave the kingdom without his permission. Urban showed himself much displeased at a claim hitherto unheard of, and which made it a crime for a primate to visit the mother Church,[2] and he told the envoy that the king would certainly be excommunicated in the council which was to open at Rome after Easter. But William succeeded in softening the holy father, after several secret audiences, and after having made skilful use of great presents and promises to different persons who were able to support his master's cause;[3] so that the pope finally granted a fresh reprieve until Michaelmas of the following year.

It was then Christmas 1098. Anselm was kept at Rome against his will by Urban, who always showed him the greatest respect.[4] Every one considered him as the second personage of the Church, and a canonised saint;[5] the English who came to Rome kissed the feet of their metropolitan as they did those of the pope. The imperialists, who formed the majority of the Roman populace, tried to carry off the

[1] "Quæ res ei non mediocrem apud cunctos videntes peperit gratiam, eo quod ostensione veræ sanctitatis vicisset famæ suæ gloriam."—GUILL. MALM., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Non Papæ! ait, quis unquam audivit talia. . . . Vere et sine omni ambiguitate dicere possumus a sæculo tale quid non esse auditum. Et pro tali responso mirabilis homo huc te fatigasti?"—EADM., 54.

[3] "Munera quibus ea cordi esse animadvertebat, dispertiendo et pollicendo."

[4] "Ipse papa frequenter ad Adselmum veniebat, læte cum eo sese agendo et curiam faciendo ei."

[5] "Semper et ubique a Papa secundus erat . . . quasi proprio nomine sanctus vocabatur."—EADM., 21.

primate by force one day when he was going from the Lateran to St. Peter's; but the mere power of his glance stopped them, and reduced them to beg his blessing.[1]

At the council held in St. Peter's a fortnight after Easter 1099, one hundred and fifty bishops renewed the decrees of Placentia and Clermont against simony and the marriage of priests. By the formal order of the pope, Anselm occupied one of the most distinguished places. While Reinger, Bishop of Lucca, was proclaiming in a loud voice, to be heard above the noise of the assembly, the canons of the council, he suddenly interrupted himself, and looking round upon his brethren with a glance of great discontent,[2] he cried, "But what are we doing, my brothers? We are unsparing of advice to docile children, and we say nothing as to the crimes of tyrants! Every day the Holy See is informed of their oppression and pillage; but what follows? Nothing; all the world knows and laments it. At this moment do I not see in this assembly a man modestly seated among us, whose silence cries aloud, whose patience and humility rise to the throne of God to accuse us?[3] It is now two years since he came to demand justice from the Holy See; and what has he obtained? If there is any one among you ignorant of whom I speak, let him know that it is of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, in England!"

At the end of his speech, the prelate, whose indignation carried him away, struck the pavement of the church three times with his crosier.[4] The pope, remembering that the reprieve granted to William had still three months to run,

[1] "Cives urbis, quorum ingens multitudo propter fidelitatem imperatoris ipsi Papæ erat infesta . . . viso vultu ejus, projectis armis," &c.

[2] "Subito admirantibus cunctis . . . unde suorum luminum acie in circumsedentes directa, vulneratæ mentis dolerem," &c.—EADM., 55.

[3] "Sed væ quid faciemus. . . . Unus ecce inter nos, modesta taciturnitate quiescens mitis residet, cujus silentium clamor magnus est, cujus humilitas, &c. Sed vel quid hucusque subventionis invenit?"—EADM., *loc. cit.* Cf. GUILL. MALMESB., *loc. cit.*

[4] "Virgam . . . tertio pavimento illisit, indignationem . . . compressis exploso murmure labiis et dentibus, palam cunctis ostendens."

stopped the bishop, saying,[1] "Enough, brother Reinger, enough! Good order shall be taken for all this." "There is much need, holy father," replied Reinger; "otherwise the cause will be carried to the tribunal of Him who never delays justice."[2]

Anselm, who had not said a word of his misfortunes to the Bishop of Lucca, was astonished at this intervention, but he still kept silence.

At the end of the council, the pope, by the unanimous advice of the bishops, published an excommunication against all those who should give or receive lay investitures for ecclesiastical dignities: "For," said he, "it is abominable that hands to which is granted the supreme honour, refused even to angels, of creating the Almighty, and offering Him in sacrifice for the salvation of the world, should be reduced to such ignominy as to be the servants of other hands, which day and night are soiled with impurity, with rapine, and with blood."

All the assembled responded, "Amen! Amen!"[3]

The day after the closing of the council, Anselm, persuaded that he should not soon obtain justice,[4] went to Lyons to visit his friend the Cardinal Hugh, having first persuaded the pope to give him as his superior the monk

[1] "Sufficit, frater Reinger, sufficit. . . . Procurabitur huic rei correctio." —EADM., GUILL. MALMESB.

[2] "Et equidem expedit, nam aliter Eum qui justa judicat non transibit."

[3] "Execrabile videri manus quæ in tantam eminentiam excreverint ut. . . . Deum cuncta creantem creent . . . ut ancillæ fiant earum manuum quæ die ac nocte obscœnis contagiis inquinantur. . . . His ab universis fiat, fiat, acclamari audivimus."—EADM. Cf. ROGER HOVED, ad ann. 1099.

[4] "Vane nos ibi consilium nihil auxilium operiri intelleximus. . . . Nihil judicii vel subventionis, præterquam quod diximus, per Romanum præsulem nacti."—EADM., 55. William of Malmesbury plainly accuses the pope of having been gained over by the king's presents; but Eadmer, who wrote on the spot, and never shrank from the truth, only blames some persons of his court. Baronius and Möhler have successfully justified Urban from these reproaches.

Eadmer, his travelling companion. Placed under this tutelage, the prelate consoled himself for his exile by work; he composed treatises of theology and philosophy; he loved to persuade himself that having returned to the rule of monastic obedience he was scrupulously fulfilling the task imposed by his superior. He showed himself, indeed, so docile towards the latter, that he would not move without his permission.[1] Anselm thus proved that he had always remained a monk; all felt that this severe discipline gave new temper to his courage and his genius.

Urban died before the expiration of the reprieve he had granted to William Rufus. In his dealings with the other northern kings he found more satisfaction. In Ireland, the relations begun by Lanfranc with the small provincial chiefs in the interest of ecclesiastical discipline and the inviolability of marriage,[2] had been continued and strengthened, thanks to the persuasive eloquence of Anselm, who was primate not only of England, but of all the British isles.[3] An Irish monk bearing, like the first apostle of his country, the name of Patrick, and consecrated bishop at Canterbury, was the principal instrument of this return to unity. While in the south of the great island of Britain the Norman king was trampling under foot the rights of the people

[1] GUILL. MALM., *de Gest. Pontif.*, i. 229. Anselm passed nearly two years at Lyons, treated by the archbishop not as a guest, "*sed sicut indigena et vere loci dominus.*" He there resumed his philosophical studies, and wrote two treatises *De conceptu virginali* and *De humana redemptione.* —EADM., 55 and 22.

[2] See his letters in BARONIUS, ad ann. 1090. They do not contain a word about the pope or the Norman royalty, nevertheless M. Thierry thus alludes to them: "After the conquest of England, the intrigues of the primate Lanfranc, a man devoted at once to the aggrandisement of the papal power and to Norman rule, were actually directed towards Ireland, and began to mould a little the national spirit of the priests of that island."—*Histoire de la conquête*, vol. iii. b. ix. p. 201. This national spirit, if it can be so called, consisted in tolerating incestuous marriages and divorce, and in buying ordination from the bishops. Lanfranc, in his letters, opposes these things only.

[3] ST. ANSELM, Ep. iii. 142–147; EADM., *Hist. nov.*, b. ii. 45.

and the Church, in the north, in Scotland, a holy and royal lady, Margaret, sprung from the ancient race of Saxon princes, and recalled from Hungary, whither her family had been exiled, to become the wife of King Malcolm III., was occupied in completing the conversion of this still half-savage kingdom by the influence of her own virtues, and the support of her pious husband. During a long reign the royal pair laid, as it were, the foundation of true Christian civilisation by releasing women[1] from a brutal yoke. To Queen Margaret belongs the honour of having prepared, by a sort of reparation made to God and her sex, the rise of that famous chivalry which in Britain, as elsewhere, was to obtain so brilliant a reputation.[2] The glorious title of patroness of Scotland, granted by Pope Clement X. to the noble princess, was well merited.

Every day Margaret herself fed 300 poor; having become a widow she gave up all her possessions to the unfortunate, and when exhausted by her last illness she caused herself to be carried into a church to hear mass. One day when she had just received the Communion she breathed her last, says Ordericus Vitalis, in the midst of prayer, like a true Catholic queen.[3] The hagiographer adds, that on the face of the holy princess, worn by age and suffering, there immediately reappeared the brilliant beauty and freshness of youth.[4]

Before leaving Great Britain, we must mention the foun-

[1] Buchanan says, in his *History of Scotland*, that she caused the abolition of feudal rights of the most infamous kind, the hideous remains of pagan slavery, and of that contempt for women which the Scotch had hitherto always displayed. See the famous letter of St. Jerome.

[2] Robert Bruce, the Douglases, Wallace, and many other heroes, until the time of Mary Stuart, when the Reformation made so great a change in the Scottish character.

[3] "Post sacræ perceptionem Eucharistiæ inter verba orationis expiravit."—ORD. VIT., viii. 701. She died in 1093.

[4] "Quo temporis momento facies ejus diuturni morbi macie ac pallore fœdata, insolita quadam venustate refloruit."—BREVIAR. ROMANORUM, die 10 Junii.

dation by King Malcolm of the Abbey of Dunfermline in Scotland, 1070, by the request of Queen Margaret, and at the place of their marriage. It is well known that Dunfermline was for a long time, like Westminster in England, a place of burial for the kings and of meeting for the national parliaments.

In Denmark, about the same time, the holy King Canute died a martyr to his zeal for the rights of the Church and his endeavours to establish tithes.[1] This prince had profited by the lessons given him by St. Gregory VII.;[2] having doubled the size of his kingdom by conquests on the shores of the Baltic, he had assured to his bishops the rank and immunities of their office. First among the northern sovereigns, he had opened his dominions to monks summoned from that very England where his ancestors had destroyed so many monasteries and their inhabitants.

After the death of Canute, a vast abbey founded over his tomb, where many miracles were constantly worked, enabled the still half-barbarous Danes to know and admire the sons of St. Benedict.[3] Thus the blood of the royal martyr sealed the triumph of Christ in the country of those very Normans who, through so many years, had been the most terrible scourge of Christendom. A little later, Magnus, son of King Olaus of Norway, founded the first bishop-

[1] July 10, 1087. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccles.*, b. lxiii. c. 37. This St. Canute must not be confounded with his nephew of the same name (Duke Canute), also a martyr, whose festival the Church celebrates January 7. King Canute was the father of Charles Count of Flanders, who also suffered martyrdom, as will be seen further on.

[2] Fleury thinks this prince was the same as Hacon or Haquin, to whom Gregory VII. addressed his Ep. vii. 5, 21.

[3] "Primus enim ritus gentis suæ . . . correxit, et metropolitanas sedes et episcopales construxit . . . monachos qui prius invisi et incogniti Danis erant, accersiit et opportunæ habitationis locum in regno suo liberaliter eis delegavit. . . . Grande cœnobium monachorum constructum est et monasticus ordo, sicut in Anglia apud Eveshannium servatur regulariter constitutus est. Inde nimirum primi monachi Danos adierunt, et cœnobiale Jus, barbaris mirantibus, diligenter ostenderunt."—ORDER. VIT., b. vii. p. 650.

rics and monasteries in that country.[1] Eric II., successor of St. Canute, anxious to free the new Christian kingdom from the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Hamburg, a great supporter of the imperial schism, went himself to Rome to beg from Pope Urban the creation of another metropolitan see in Denmark.[2] The pope promised to grant his request; and some years later, a cardinal legate, after having visited all the Scandinavian cities, chose that of Lund to be the new metropolitan see of the three kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.[3]

Eric, who had taken the cross, started immediately for Jerusalem; but he died on the way. This eager homage of a distant kingdom only just received into the fold of the Church must have consoled the great heart of Urban, who at that moment was forced to contend with the three most powerful sovereigns of the West—the Emperor, the King of England, and the King of France.

In the Church's resistance to King Philip, Yves, Bishop of Chartres, seemed called upon to play, with some differences, the part acted in England by Anselm of Canterbury. The direction of the principal affairs of the Church in his country belonged to the French prelate. About this very time a painful dispute had broken out between Yves and the Archbishop-legate Hugh of Lyons respecting the election to the metropolitan see of Sens of a noble named Daimbert, much esteemed for his learning, and a great friend of the monks.[4] Hugh having forbidden the bishops of the province to consider the newly elect as legitimate,

[1] "Episcopatus et cœnobia monachorum, quæ antecessores ejus non noverant."—ORDER. VIT., b. x. p. 767.

[2] "Patriam ac domestica sacra saxonica prælatione liberare petivit."—SAXO GRAMMAT., b. xii. This journey took place after 1095, according to PAGI, *Crit in Baron.*, ad ann. 1092.

[3] "Celeberrimis Danorum urbibus inspectis, cuncta curiose collustrando."—SAXO GRAMM., *loc. cit.* This arrangement was only completed in 1103 under Pascal II. Eric died at Cyprus in 1101.

[4] According to the testimony of the chronicler of St. Pierre-le-Vif, who wrote about this time.

until he had recognised the rights of the primacy of Lyons, which, according to him, had been despised by the previous archbishops of Sens, Yves, suffragan of Sens, protested strongly against the interdiction.[1] Daimbert acted as Yves of Chartres had done when unjustly persecuted; he went to Rome and obtained his consecration from the pope.[2] It is certain that the Bishop of Chartres had really right on his side;[3] but in his letter to the legate Hugh he had expressed opinions on the right of investitures and the conduct of the pope's ministers, which drew upon him severe censure. "I wish," he had written to the legate, "and many pious souls wish as I do, that the ministers of the Roman Church would apply themselves as experienced physicians to curing great evils, and not give their enemies reason to say, '*You strain at a gnat and swallow a camel;*'[4] we see, in fact, the greatest crimes openly committed in the world, but we do not see you employ the axe of justice to cut them away." Such a reproach could not certainly be applied to Archbishop Hugh, who had distinguished himself by his zeal in promulgating the excommunication against the emperor and the French king. But the serious matter was the justification of royal investiture, which Yves declared in the following words:[5] "Pope Urban, if we have clearly understood him, only excludes kings from corporal investiture, not from the right of election as being chiefs of the people, nor from cession.[6] And what does it matter whether this cession is made by the hand, or a movement of the head, or by the mouth, or by the crosier? For kings do not pretend to give any spiritual gifts, but only to consent to the election, or to grant to the elect those

[1] Ep. 60. Ed. Juret and Souchet, 1645.

[2] March 1098. PAGI, *Crit.*, ad ann. 1099, c. 3.

[3] Baronius declares himself most decidedly against Hugh.—Ad ann. 1099.

[4] "Culicem excolantes et camelum glutientes."—Matt. xxii. 24.

[5] YVON., Ep. No. 60.

[6] "Non ab electione, in quantum sunt caput populi, vel concessione." —*Ibid.*

lands and other material possessions which the churches have received from their liberality."[1]

It was the legate's duty to transmit these strange declarations to the pope, who showed much indignation against the bishop. Yves then hastened to write to Urban. "I am," he said, "the lowest of your sons; but I do not believe there is any one on this side the Alps who has suffered so many affronts and wrongs as I have done in the endeavour to remain faithful and obedient to your commands. But since my words have given offence, it is not fitting for me to enter into controversy with you, and I would rather renounce my bishopric than expose myself to your reproaches, just or unjust. If this atonement satisfies you, accept it. If you require more, say what I ought to do. If I cease to be your servant, let me at least continue to be your son.[2] . . . What I wish to do with your authority, I am forced to do by the ever-deepening enmity of the King of France towards me."

This enmity had arisen since the relapse of Philip, whose connection with Bertrade the bishop had so vigorously denounced. The monarch had now in fact recalled that same Bertrade whom he had carried off from her husband Count Fulk of Anjou, while his own lawful wife still lived; and whom, when he was excommunicated, he had been obliged to dismiss. Bertrade exercised so extraordinary an empire over those around her, that she obtained the pardon of her double infidelity from her husband Count Fulk, who carried his complaisance so far as to seat himself in public at the feet of this bigamous queen.[3]

[1] Fleury's translation, b. lxiv. No. 44.

[2] "Ivo minimus Sanctitatis Suæ filius. . . . Hanc si placet, accipite, si plus placet, addite. Si desisto vester esse servus, non desistam vester esse filius."—Ep. 67. Baronius, Fleury, and the *Hist. litt. de France* place this letter in 1099. But Pagi has shown that it ought to be at the beginning of 1098.

[3] "Ita mollificaverat, ut eam tanquam dominam veneraretur, et scabello pedum ejus sæpius residens ac si præstigio fieret, voluntati ejus omnino obsequeretur."—SUGER, *Vit. Lud. VI.*, c. 17.

Such a revival of a scandal supposed to be ended, obliged the Church to renew the severe punishment which had already fallen upon Philip of France. When this royal breaker of the divine law arrived in any diocese, the bells of all the churches were silent, the sounds of chanting ceased, the public worship of God was stopped, and signs of mourning were everywhere manifested. During the fifteen years of his life in which his ardent and lamentable passion for Bertrade kept him apart from the communion of the Church, Philip had at least so much conscience as to respect, to a certain point, the public affliction; he contented himself with hearing mass in private when the prelates, whose temporal lord he was, permitted it; he abstained from all State ceremonies, then inextricably mingled with those of the Church, and from solemnly wearing his crown on the great annual festivals.[1] However, on Christmas-day, 1097, in spite of the formal prohibition of the apostolic legate,[2] an archbishop, Raoul of Tours, was found who was not afraid on the occasion of the festival to place the crown publicly on the head of the adulterous monarch. This act of guilty weakness was rewarded the next day by the nomination to the bishopric of Orleans of a creature of the prelate named John, whose extreme youth and debauched life scandalised the whole city. Yves of Chartres, with his usual vigour, denounced the shameful bargain to the pope and his legate Hugh.[3] He accused the newly elect and his protector of the most vile crimes,[4] and bitterly complained of the conduct of the Archbishop

[1] "Nec purpuram induit, neque solemnitatem aliquam regio more celebravit. In quodcumque oppidum vel urbem Galliarum rex advenisset . . . cessabat omnis clangor campanarum, et generalis cantus clericorum, Luctus itaque publicus agebatur et dominicus cultus privatim exercebatur. quamdiu transgressor princeps in eadem diœcesi commorabatur. Permissu tamen præsulum quorum dominus erat," &c.—ORDER. VIT., viii. 699.

[2] "Contra interdictum legati vestri."—YVON., Ep. *ad Pap.*, *loc. cit.*

[3] Ep. 66, 67, 68.

[4] "Rex Francorum non private sed publice mihi testatus est quod prædicti Joannis succubus fuerit (Radulphus archiepiscopus)."—Ep. 66.

of Tours, who said openly that he had no need to trouble himself either in seeking good priests, or about the canons, for that he had in his purse [1] what would smooth all difficulties. "Whatever may happen, whatever side you may take," wrote the Bishop of Chartres to the pope, "I have cleared my conscience and delivered my soul. I have raised my voice for the cause of truth and charity, for the good of the Church, and for your honour." [2]

The disagreement of Yves of Chartres with Hugh left, however, so little trace on the mind of the great bishop, that at about this period he begged the Holy See to reappoint his opponent to the office of legate, saying that he was more capable than any one else of filling it.[3] The eager rivalry which for so long had existed between the metropolitan sees of Lyons and Sens, and which had divided the two chief prelates of the Church of France, Archbishop Hugh and Bishop Yves, was arranged [4] in April 1099, to the general satisfaction, in that same Council of Rome where we have seen Anselm of Canterbury surrounded by the homage of the episcopate, and defended, as he deserved, by the Bishop of Lucca. It was on the same day also that the pope pronounced, amidst the acclamations of the whole assembly,[5] a new and final sentence against lay investiture, and against the homage required by princes from Church dignitaries. These acclamations, which proved the mainstay of spiritual liberty among the Catholics of the West, were soon

[1] "Se non indigere bonis clericis vel canonibus cum hæc omnia præsto sint ei in marsupio suo."—Ep. 66.

[2] "Quidquid autem vos faciatis, ego liberavi animam meam."—*Ibid.* "Et vere dixi et pro veritate et caritate dixi: providens quantum in me est, et Ecclesiæ utilitati et vestræ honestati."—Ep. 68. Either John must have completely repented of his crimes, or Yves must have discovered the injustice of his accusations, since we find him later in friendly relations with this same John, who filled the see of Orleans satisfactorily for twenty years.

[3] Ep. 109.

[4] EPIST. URB., ad HUG., PAGI, *Crit.*, ad ann. 1099, c. 5.

[5] "Et ab omnibus acclamatum est: Fiat, fiat; et consummatum est concilium."—ROGER HOVEDEN, ad ann. 1099.

echoed by those which saluted the news of the marvellous triumph obtained by the Crusaders in the East. After a thousand difficulties and perils, the remains of the Catholic army had at length reached Syria, taken Antioch, and established a Christian principality there under Bohemond the Norman. Adhémar du Puy, the legate, being dead, the Crusaders begged Pope Urban to come in person, and put himself at their head in that very town of Antioch where St. Peter had occupied his first see, and where the Galileans had first borne the name of Christians. "We have conquered the Turks and pagans;" said the leaders of the Crusade, "it will be easy for us to conquer the heretics, Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, and Jacobites; come then, we conjure you, Holy Father, come, and perform the functions of St. Peter's vicar; come, and sit upon the Apostle's throne! Encouraged by your authority we will root out all heresies; you will open to us the gates of Jerusalem,[1] you will redeem the tomb of Christ, you will exalt the name of Christian to the highest, and the whole world will be brought into obedience to you."

But, to obey their wishes, Urban must have abandoned the defence of the Church from lay heresy, since it claimed spiritual dominion now, the most dangerous of all. The Christian army, therefore, without its head, continued its heroic march, and Jerusalem was by a victorious assault snatched from the hands of the infidels, July 15, 1099, at three o'clock in the afternoon—the very hour when our Lord Jesus Christ died for men. On the rescued tomb of the Saviour a Christian sovereignty was instantly proclaimed

[1] "Tibi mandamus ut qui sermonibus tuis nos omnes terras nostras et quidquid in terris erat relinquere fecisti, complendo quæ hortatus es, ad nos venias. . . . In cathedra quam quotidie cernimus. . . . Illi qui prius vocabantur Galilæi, hic primum vocati sunt christiani . . . nos enim Turcos et Paganos expugnavimus; hæreticos autem nequivimus. . . . Omnes hæreses cujuscumque gentis sunt, tua auctoritate et nostra virtute eradices et destruas . . . et etiam portas utriusque Jerusalem nobis aperias," &c.—Letter of 11th September 1098.—Ap. REUDER, *Script. rer. German.*, p. 399; GUILL. TYR., b. vii. c. 1, &c.

by the victors. Godfrey de Bouillon, who had taken no part in the massacre of the infidels, was elected king; but he was not crowned, not choosing, as he said, to wear a crown of gold where his Divine Master had worn a crown of thorns.[1]

Faithful to the customs of that chivalry of which he had become the head, Godfrey soon after founded, in the valley of Jehosaphat, a monastery where he established the monks who had accompanied him to the Crusade; he also introduced the Latin ritual into the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and appointed as precentor a canon of Paris, wishing to show by this liturgical reformation the antipathy of the victorious West for all that belonged to the degenerate Church of the East.[2]

After assisting at the election of Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa, and legate of Urban II., to be the first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, Godfrey de Bouillon begged to receive from that prelate the investiture of his new kingdom. Nothing, assuredly, could better show how completely the new Catholic king had changed the opinions which had formerly led him into the Imperialist ranks.

Urban II. was called to render his account to Him whose vicar he had been on earth fifteen days after the glorious accomplishment of that task which he had preached at Clermont. He died, not like Gregory VII. in exile, but in the

[1] GUILL. TYR., b. ix. c. 9.

[2] This has been thoroughly understood by M. Didion with regard to the arts. "It is supposed," he says, "but quite wrongly, that the Crusaders brought back to Europe and to France the arts of the East: exactly the opposite of this is true. There is not in France a single church built by the Crusaders in the style or on the plan of the Eastern churches; in Greece, on the other hand, at Mistra, and at Chalcis, the Crusaders from Champagne became lords of the Morea, built churches in the style of France and Champagne. At Jerusalem, the Crusaders rebuilt the Holy Sepulchre in pointed architecture exactly as if they had been in France. . . . Far from borrowing a musical system from the East, the Crusaders carried their own even to the stone of the Holy Sepulchre, to the very tomb of Christ. *We have given all to the East, and received nothing from thence.*"—DIDION, *Annal. Archéol.*, vol. v. pp. 77–79.

moment of a double victory. The successor of St. Peter had re-entered Rome while the Cross re-entered Jerusalem. The double despotism of Cæsar and Mahomet, firmly seated for so many centuries, yielded before the keys of the Apostle and the sword of Catholic knighthood. It is true that this was not a complete and lasting success; such is not the portion of the Church on earth; but before returning to his Divine Master, Urban was enabled to enjoy one of those glorious and sublime moments which fully compensate for ages of painful combat, and which may well be said to illuminate all the future. When the body of the pontiff, who had just died within a few paces of St. Peter's[1] prison, had been lowered into the vaults of the Vatican basilica, there to be placed beside the relics of the first pope,[2] it could be truly proclaimed throughout Christendom that the eleven years of his pontificate had been but one heroic and sublime warfare with the enemies of God. Full of devotion for St. Peter, having never known the fear of man, never suffered the smallest infringement of the liberty of the Church, an ardent promoter of the worship of the Queen of Heaven, to whom he had specially consecrated Saturday,[3] Urban was surely worthy to be associated with the saints in paradise as one of themselves.[4]

Contemporaries of the illustrious pontiff said of him that

[1] *Cod. Vatic.*, ap. BARON., ad ann. 1099, 24.

[2] "Eximius pontifex, post multos labores pro Ecclesia Dei summa cum moderatione toleratos, post domitos patientia magis quam armis adversarios. . . ."—MABILL., vol. v. b. lxix. No. 108.

[3] "It was he who specially consecrated Saturday to the Blessed Virgin, and who instituted, or at any rate brought into more frequent use, the short service of Our Lady."—MABILL., *Ann.*, *loc. cit.*

[4] "Non erat hic rector tremulus quasi cannula vento;
Sed veluti ferrum truncabat noxia verbo:
Cuncta sibi prava subduntur dogmata falsa;
Nunquam decrevit libertas denique Sedis
Romanæ per eum: sanctum quia peramat Petrum
Aureus antistes. . . .
. . . Sanctis merito sociatus."
—DOMNIZO, *Vit. Math.*, b. ii. c. 11.

he was a golden pope, profoundly devoted to St. Peter, who had never suffered the independence of the Roman Church to dwindle in his hands, and whose virtues had always equalled his talents.

It was again a monk, and a monk of Cluny, who was chosen as his successor. Three popes[1] of the same order, such as Hildebrand, Didier of Monte Cassino, and Odo of Cluny, must naturally have encouraged the cardinals[2] to make another selection from the monastic ranks. Their choice fell upon Regnier, a Tuscan, who, after having embraced a religious life at Cluny under the crosier of St. Hugh, had been called from it by Gregory VII., had become a cardinal, and later, abbot of the monastery of St. Lawrence and St. Stephen outside the walls of Rome.

The moment he was informed of his election, Regnier fled and hid himself; but his retreat was discovered, and he was obliged by force to accept the purple, the tiara, and the girdle, whence hung the seven keys, symbols of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.[3]

The new pope received the name of Pascal II. He hastened to announce his accession to the Catholic princes and the Countess Matilda, and did not forget to send the information, as Urban II. had done, to his spiritual father, the holy Abbot Hugh of Cluny, who saw in him a second son worthy of the pontifical throne.[4] Pascal II. then addressed solemn felicitations to the Crusaders, whose heroism

1 Gregory VII., Victor III., and Urban II.

2 "Patres cardinales, episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi, primores urbis, primi scriniarii et scribæ regionarii in Ecclesia sancti Clementis conveniunt."—PAND. PISAN., ap. BARON., et PAPEBROCH. CONAT., *Act. SS. Maii* b. vii.

3 "Fugit, latuitque, sed non diu potuit . . . invenitur, trahitur in conventum, convenitur de fuga, redarguitur a patribus . . . chlamyde coccinea induitur et tiara . . . baltheo succingitur cum septem exinde pendentibus clavibus, ex quo sciat, septem sigillis, septiformem Spiritus sancti gratiam cunctarum Ecclesiarum, quibus simul, Deo auctore, præest, regimini in claudendo aperiendoque . . . providere debere."—*Ibid.* He was elected August 3, 1099.

4 MABILL., *Ann., loc. cit.*

had freed the Holy Land, and reconquered, together with the spear still red with Divine blood, a great portion of the cross on which the Redeemer died for us.

At the same time, Pascal sent them a new legate, charged to watch over the purity and safety of their souls. "May God," said the pope, in conclusion, "absolve you from all your sins, and recompense you for your exile by opening to you the gates of the eternal country." [1]

He proved, at the same time, his zeal for that monastic freedom in which he had himself been trained.[2] He received, almost immediately on his accession, letters of adhesion and warning from Yves of Chartres,[3] and other letters from Anselm of Canterbury, in which that prelate related his difficulties and asked for instructions.[4] Finally, wanting money to provide for his most imperative needs, he was talking of it one day with the cardinals, when he saw approaching some envoys from Roger of Sicily, who, saluting him in the name of the Norman prince, laid a tribute of 1000 ounces of gold at his feet.[5]

Meanwhile the battle which the new pope had to maintain against the enemies of the Apostolic See lost nothing of its intensity. The anti-pope Guibert, who, under the name of Clement III., had held his ground for twenty years against the legitimate popes, and boasted of surviving them, died shortly after Pascal's accession, and was destined to have but insignificant successors in his usurped dignity.[6]

[1] "Videmus orientalem Ecclesiam, post longa captivitatis tempora, magna ex parte ad antiquam libertatis gloriam rediisse. . . . Ipse vos ab omnibus peccatis absolvat, et exilio vestro patriam æternam tribuat."—PASCH., *Epist.*, No. 1, in *Concil.*; LABB., ed. COLETTI, xii. 966.

[2] See his letters in support of the exemption of Montierender against the Bishop of Châlons, and of Ely against the Bishop of Lincoln, in MABILL., *Ann.*

[3] YVON., Ep. 81.

[4] ANSELM, Ep. iii. 40.

[5] "Dum cujus dispositionis acriter ageretur negotium, legati . . . curiam intrant, ex parte comitis officiosissime papam salutant et resalutant, atque inclinati ad pedes ejus posuerunt auri uncias mille."—PAND. PISAN., *loc. cit.*

[6] See their fortunes in *Vit. Paschal.*, ap. *Conc.*, COLETTI, xii. 963; and PAGI, *Crit.*, ad ann. 1100.

But the Emperor Henry, author of the schism and patron of the anti-pope, had not only recovered from his repeated defeats, but had even recently been able so to strengthen his forces as to be in a condition once more to invade Italy.

In France, during this time, King Philip had again fallen into his former evil ways, and was consequently in revolt against the Church.

In England, ever since the Conqueror's death, the Norman king had trodden under foot with impunity the rights of the clergy and of the faithful. To her three redoubtable adversaries the Church opposed three champions, with whom victory was destined to remain: the immortal Matilda, whom God, says a historian, had placed on the threshold of Italy to confound imperial pride and tyranny;[1] Yves of Chartres, that bishop of iron will[2] but moderate judgment, who could resist even a king of France; and Anselm, the monk who refused to bend to the yoke of William Rufus.

When William heard of the death of Urban II., whose goodwill, it is said, he had purchased, he was so enraged that he cried out, "May God's anger light on whoever mourns for him!" But directly after, he asked, "What sort of a man is the new pope?" And when they told him that in many respects he resembled Anselm, he said, "By the Face of God, if that is so, he is good for nothing! But no matter; for I swear that, this time, his primacy will weigh very little with me. I am free now, and I mean to do as I like."[3] And, in fact, he refused to acknowledge the new pope, and continued to oppress his people. In an expedition against his vassal Hélie de la Flèche, Count of Mans, a knight as pious and charitable as he was brave,

[1] "Admirabilem illam fœminam, quam ob confusionem tyrannicæ superbiæ posuit Deus obicem in ipso Italiæ ingressu."—BARON., ad ann. 1100, c. 7.

[2] "Ferreus ille Yvonis animus."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Et Dei odium habeat qui inde curat. Ille vero qui modo est Papa, cujusmodi est? . . . Per vultum Dei, si talis est, non valet. . . . Ego interim libertate potitus agam quodlibet."—EADMER, *Hist. novorum*, b. i. p. 56.

and as much beloved by his subjects as the Red King was hated by his,[1] William, having taken and burnt Mans, treated as a criminal the bishop of the city, Hildebert, one of the most illustrious priests of his time, and friend of Yves of Chartres and Anselm of Canterbury. The crime of this prelate, so worthy in all points of the affection of the two great theologians of France and England,[2] was, that he had been elected by the clergy without the royal authorisation.[3] William having the venerable bishop in his power, accused him of treason, ordered him to destroy the towers of the cathedral, which commanded the castle, and on his refusal, plundered all his property, and did not leave him so much as a mitre.

Although he was accustomed to ridicule the appeal to God's judgment by the ordeal of red-hot iron whenever he thought it would result well for the victims of his despotism,[4] William required Hildebert to submit to this form of trial forbidden to him by the canons of the Church; and to force him to it, kept him confined in a dungeon, chained hand and foot, for more than a year.[5] This last crime filled up the measure: the justice of God prepared to strike; the

[1] ORDER. VIT., b. x. pp. 769 and 774. Ordericus adds that he was *instar presbyteri bene tonsus*, which showed the regularity of his life.—See *Opera* S. ANSELMI., YVON., CARNOT., ORDER., *et passim*.

[2] He had been a pupil and admirer of Berengarius, but had soon returned to the orthodox faith. Noel, Bishop of Mans, had placed him at the head of the schools in his diocese. In his youth he had been accused of various irregularities of life, as is proved by a letter of Yves of Chartres; but Pagi and Beaugendre, editors of his works (folio, 1708), have refuted these accusations. It is thought that he had been a monk, or at least a scholar, at Cluny.

[3] In 1097. Count Helie, on the contrary, though he had nominated another candidate, respected the choice of Hildebert, "*quia Deum timebat et ne lethale in membris Ecclesiæ schisma fieret.*"—ORDER. VIT., x. 770.

[4] He complained that God was won over by the prayers of the first-comer: "Quid est hoc? Deus est justus judex? Pereat qui deinceps hoc crediderit. Quare per hoc et hoc meo judicio amodo respondebitur, non Dei quod pro voto cujusque hinc inde plicatur."—EADM., p. 52.

[5] YVO., CARNOT., Ep. 74; BARON., ad ann. 1107; PAGI, *Crit.* in eumd.; BEAUGENDRE, *Vita Hildeb.*, xix.

people, warned by the mysterious light of faith, felt a prophetic thrill, precursor of their deliverance. A monk[1] of Gloucester saw in a dream the Lord seated on a throne in glory, surrounded by the host of heaven; prostrate at His feet was a virgin of the most brilliant beauty, who said, "Thou who didst die upon the cross for the salvation of the human race, look with pity upon Thy people crushed under William's yoke. O avenger of all crimes, avenge me upon William, and snatch me from the hands that torment and defile me!" And the Lord answered, "Wait yet a little; vengeance is near, and shall be complete."[2] At these words the monk awoke, trembling, but assured that the virgin represented the Holy Church, and that God was preparing to punish the king for his excesses. Abbot Serlon, being informed of what had happened, instantly wrote to William to warn him of the sinister augury.[3] On Wednesday, August 1, 1100, the festival of St. Peter in bonds, another monk named Foucher, Abbot of Shrewsbury, went up into the pulpit, and after having depicted the desperate state of England, announced the approaching crisis in these words: "A sudden change of affairs is at hand. . . . God will not be overruled by the unworthy. Behold the bow of the divine fury is drawn against the wicked; the swift arrow is taken from the quiver to wound them. Suddenly it will smite them!"[4]

The very day following that on which the monk Foucher thus preached, an arrow from an unknown hand pierced the Red King to the heart while he hunted in that famous New Forest, to plant which his father had depopulated thirty-six

[1] "Bonæ famæ, sed melioris vitæ."—ORDER. VIT., b. ix. p. 781.

[2] "Splendidissima virgo. . . . Scelerum vindex omniumque judex justissime, de Guillelmo, precor, vindica me. . . . Patienter tolera, paulisper exspecta."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Commonitorios opices."—*Ibid.*

[4] "En subitanea rerum instabit immutatio . . . non Deus dominabuntur effeminati. . . . Ecce arcus superni furoris contra reprobos intensus est et sagitta velox ad vulnerandum de pharetra extracta est. Repente jam feriet."— ORDER., *loc. cit.*

parishes. That day, at sunrise, a monk from Gloucester had brought to the king a letter in which Abbot Serlon related the threatening vision seen by a brother of his monastery. At the reading of this letter, the king, who was at table with his courtiers, burst out laughing, and cried, "I wonder why Dom Serlon, whom I imagined a wise abbot, should have thought of telling me of such things, and writing to me about them from such a distance. Does he take me for one of those Englishmen who put off their journeys or their affairs to another day, because an old woman has dreamed or sneezed the night before?" [1]

Saying this, the king rode away to the chase. His last words, addressed to Walter Tyrrel, one of his companions, were "Shoot, shoot, in the devil's name!" And at the same instant an arrow, whether Walter's or another, passed through his breast.[2] The prince's body, placed on a charcoal-burner's cart, with blood dripping from it along the road, was carried to Winchester: but the church-bells, which announce the obsequies of the humblest Christian, the poorest beggar, did not toll for the monarch; and of all the treasures he had heaped up at the expense of his people, not one penny was given for the good of his soul.[3] When this terrible act of divine justice was being accomplished, Anselm visited several monasteries of Bourgogne and Auvergne. At Marcigny the holy Abbot Hugh of Cluny related to him how on the

[1] "Rex in cachinnum resolutus est. . . . Miror unde Domino meo Serloni talia narrandi voluntas exorta est. . . . Ex nimia simplicitate mihi . . . somnia sternutantium retulit. . . . Num prosequi me ritum autumat Anglorum qui pro sternutatione vel somnio vetularum . . . his dictis celer surrexit et cornipedem ascendens in sylvam festinavit."—ORDER., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Trahe, trahe arcum, ex parte diaboli."—HENRIC. KNYGHTON, p. 2373. Abbot Suger relates that Tyrrel, who was supposed to be the cause of this death, often swore to him that he had not even seen the king in the forest. —*Vit. Lud., passim* ap. SELDEN, *not.*, in EADM., p. 190.

[3] "Cruore undatim per totam viam stillante."—WILL. MALM., p. 126, ap. THIERRY. "Regem veluti ferocem aprum venabulis confossum . . . detulerunt. Signa etiam pro illo in quibusdam ecclesiis non sonuerunt, quæ pro infimis pauperibus et mulierculis crebro diutissime pulsata sunt." —ORD., *loc. cit.*

previous night, in a dream, he had seen King William appear as a criminal before the throne of God, where he had been tried and condemned.[1] At Chaise-Dieu the archbishop heard of the king's death; he wept much, and in a voice broken by sobs declared that he would a thousand times rather have died himself[2] than have seen the king perish in this manner.

Meantime there soon arrived messengers from the new King of England and his barons, who begged Anselm to return as quickly as possible, declaring that all the affairs of the kingdom suffered from his absence.[3]

Henry, younger brother of William, had hastened to seize the paternal throne, to the injury of the elder, Robert of Normandy; but on the day of his coronation he had been obliged to swear to respect the good and holy laws of King Edward, and to atone for the wickedness of the preceding reign. The new king had therefore published throughout the kingdom a charter, imposed by the barons, in which the rights of inheritance, marriage, and guardianship were guaranteed. Anselm then thought he might yield to the popular wish and return to England. But instead of tranquillity, he found a new battle to be fought on a ground yet more difficult than before. After having endured the brutal violence of a species of crowned bandit, the archbishop was now to find himself placed between his clearly-defined duty as primate and the artful policy of a prince whose skill and finesse were such as to well merit his surname of *Beauclerc*.

For any other the position would have been dangerous;

[1] "Intulit testimonio veritatis proxime præterita nocte regem ante thronum Dei accusatum, judicatum, sententiamque damnationis in eum promulgatum."—EADM., 23.

[2] "At ille singultu verba ejus interrumpente, asseruit quod . . . multum magis eligeret seipsum corpore, quam illum sicut erat mortuum esse."

[3] "Omnia negotia regni ad audientiam et dispositionem ipsius referens pendere dilata."—EADM., 57. See in Ep. ANS. iii. 41, the king's letter, in which he excuses himself for having been crowned by other bishops in the primate's absence.

but Anselm came back from his three years' exile more steadfast and resolute than ever. Armed with that gentleness which, as he himself said, had but once deserted him since he became a monk,[1] he possessed also the heroic firmness a noble nature draws from humility and a strong sense of duty.[2] The archbishop had spoken to the new pope[3] of his intentions. "I left England," he had said, "for the love and fear of God and the honour of His Church, and I will never return thither but for the same cause."[4]

On his arrival in England,[5] and on the very day of his first interview with the king, Anselm declared that he would no longer submit to the custom of investiture and homage which William had before imposed on him, and he justified his refusal by communicating to Henry the prohibitory decrees given by the Council of Rome in his presence the preceding year. "If my lord the king does not accept these decrees," added the primate, "there will be neither advantage nor honour for me in remaining in England, whither I am not come to see the king disobey the sovereign pontiff; I cannot remain in communion with any one who receives investiture from the royal hand."

Henry thought best to temporise, and obtained from Anselm a delay for the purpose of consulting the Holy See. The king wished to have on his side the authority and moral weight of the primate, for two reasons: first of all, he desired to see his marriage sanctioned with Matilda, daughter

[1] WILL. MALMESBURY, *op. cit.*

[2] "Fortezza ed umiltate e largo core." See the admirable article in the Anglican work *The British Critic*, vol. xxxiv. p. 101.

[3] "Precor et obsecro quanto possum affectu, ut nullo modo me in Angliam redire jubeatis, nisi ita ut legem et voluntatem Dei, et decreta apostolica voluntati hominis liceat mihi præferre," &c.—Ep. iv. 40.

[4] "Sicut propter timorem et amorem Dei et honorem ejus et Ecclesiæ ejus egressus sum de Anglia, ita nunquam egrediar in illam, nisi propter et secundum eamdem causam."—Suppl. Ep. ii. It is entitled: *Anselmus, Dei gratia, archiepiscopus Cantuariensis exul.*

[5] He landed at Dover, Sept. 23, 1100.

of St. Margaret of Scotland, a princess descended from the ancient race of Anglo-Saxon kings;[1] and secondly, he felt the necessity of defending his kingdom against his elder brother Robert, now returned from the Holy Land and prepared to claim the crown.

Before the death of William, Matilda had taken refuge in a convent to avoid the danger of violence at the hands of the Norman conquerors, and had even received the black veil from the hands of her aunt the abbess; but she declared that this had been against her positive wishes. After having consulted a council of bishops, nobles, and monks, Anselm, judging Matilda to be perfectly free,[2] blessed her marriage, and crowned her queen, but not without taking the greatest precautions to prove the excellence of his motives. He was, nevertheless, accused of culpable complaisance towards the king.[3]

After this, when Robert was on the point of landing in England,[4] Anselm, as the representative of the English nobility and people, received the oaths from Henry,[5] who again swore always to govern his country by just and good laws, and, in particular, promised the archbishop to leave him full liberty to exercise all the rights of the Church, and to obey the pope. Anselm not only joined the royal army in person with his vassals, but he exercised so great an influence, by his character and exhortations, over the principal

[1] See in Thierry, *Hist. de la conq. des Normands*, vol. ii. p. 345, the political importance of this alliance for the Norman king.

[2] "Pater ipse totam regni nobilitatem populumque minorem pro hoc circumfluentem . . . sublimius cæteris stans in commune edocuit quo ordine causa Virginis quam fama vulgarat, per episcopos, &c., determinata fuit."—EADM., 59.

[3] "Anselmum in hoc a rectitudine deviasse nonnulla pars hominum, ut ipsi audivimus, blasphemavit."—EADM., 58.

[4] It may be seen, from the letter of Pope Pascal II. to Anselm (Ep. iii. 42), that the pontiff was very favourable to Robert, as being a Crusader.

[5] "Tota regni nobilitas cum populi numerositate Anselmum inter se et regem medium fecerunt, quatenus ei vice sui manu in manum porrecta promitteret justis et sanctis legibus se totum regnum quoad viveret, in cunctis administraturum."—EADMER.

nobles, that Robert, finding himself unsupported, was obliged to renounce his pretensions.[1]

The danger once past, Henry, according to his custom, forgot all his oaths, and began to attack the Church. Anselm had again to suffer all the succession of trials which he believed to have been exhausted under William, and without finding more support or courage than formerly among his colleagues in the episcopate. The king, after having restored to the see of Canterbury the property usurped by William, never ceased to complain bitterly of the innovation which, he said, had been introduced by the prohibition of investitures and homage. This was, in fact, an innovation,[2] or rather it was a necessary return to the primitive independence of the Church, too long fallen into contempt, especially in England, where the undue preponderance of the royal power had from time immemorial acquired the force of law.

The mission Anselm had received was to finish in England the work begun in the universal Church by St. Gregory VII. The answer given by Pope Pascal when first consulted by the king, after Anselm's return, had been decisive. He said thus: "The Lord speaks as follows—I am the door, *Ego sum ostium*. He who shall enter by me shall be saved. But if kings pretend to be the door of the Church, those who enter by them into it will not be shepherds but robbers."

And after alluding to the resistance of St. Ambrose to the Emperor Theodosius, the holy Father added: "The holy Roman Church, in the person of our predecessors, in spite of the cruel persecution of tyrants, has strongly resented royal usurpation and the abominable custom of investiture. We have full confidence that the Lord will not permit Peter to lose his power in our person. . . . Do not believe, O king,

[1] "Si post gratiam Dei fidelitas et industria non intercessisset Anselmi, Henricus rex ea tempestate perdidisset jus Anglici regni."—EADMER.

[2] Different passages of Ordericus Vitalis (chiefly b. iii. p. 125, ed. Leprévost; b. viii. p. 698, ed. Duch.) prove that investiture by the crosier was practised in Normandy as well as in England throughout the eleventh century.

that by renouncing a usurped and profane privilege you will weaken your authority: far from that, your authority will but gain more vigour, more strength, and more glory, when the Lord Jesus reigns in your kingdom." [1]

Vain endeavours! for the king none the less persisted in claiming from Anselm either homage, or the consecration of bishops whom he had invested, under pain of being driven from the kingdom. "I care nothing for what they may think at Rome of Anselm's protestations," replied the monarch. "I do not choose to give up the customs of my predecessors, and I will suffer no person in my kingdom who is independent of me." [2] Unfortunately, among the English bishops the only dispute was who should most completely yield to the king's will.[3] Anselm formally declared that he would not leave the kingdom, and that he would wait until they came to attack him in his church.

In this state of things it was agreed to send to Rome a new embassy composed of persons of consequence, to warn the pope that Anselm would be exiled and England withdrawn from pontifical obedience if the *statu quo* was not maintained. The archbishop sent two of his monks to represent him, and the king intrusted his interest to three bishops.[4] One of these three was able to judge, to his own cost, how deep an impression the primate s exile had made in France even upon monks most separated from public affairs; for having been stopped on his journey through the Lyonnais, and plundered by a robber lord called Guy, he could not obtain his release until he had sworn expressly

[1] "Ecclesia Romana . . . regiæ usurpationi et investituræ abominabili obviare . . . et gravissimis persecutionibus per tyrannos affecta . . . non destitit. . . . Tunc validius, tunc robustius, tunc honorabilius regnabis, cum in regno tuo divina regnabit auctoritas."—Ap. EADM., 60.

[2] "Quid ad me? usus antecessorum meorum nolo perdere, nec in regno meo qui meus non sit quemquam sustinere."—EADM., 60.

[3] "Episcopis . . . in singulis regiæ voluntati parere certantibus, imo ne romano pontifici subderetur summopere insistentibus."

[4] The Archbishop of York, and Bishops of Norwich and Chester.

that he would do nothing at Rome contrary to the honour or interest of Archbishop Anselm.[1]

The pope, as may well be supposed, did not receive the application of the bishops with favour, but repulsed with indignation the proposal they made to him to sacrifice the decrees of the holy Fathers to the threats of one man.[2] This was the substance of the answers addressed both to the prince and the Archbishop of Canterbury.[3] In his letter to the latter, the holy Father reminded him, that in the council just held at the Lateran he had renewed the former decrees against investiture and homage done to sovereigns, and added, in conclusion: "Thanks be to God that the episcopal authority has been maintained by you; placed amidst barbarians, neither the violence of tyrants nor the favour of the powerful, neither steel nor fire, have been able to hinder you from proclaiming the truth. We conjure you to continue to act and speak as you have hitherto done. Be certain that we will be on your side. We believe that we have the same mind as our Fathers, according to which we speak. And the word of God is still free."[4]

On the return of the envoys, the king convoked a Parliament in London on St. Michael's day, 1102, and again summoned Anselm either to obey him or leave the kingdom. The archbishop referred to the letter just received from Rome. "Let him show his, if he likes," said the king, "but, this time, I will not make mine public: however, there is no question just now of correspondence; it is only necessary for the primate to say whether he will obey me—yes or no."[5]

[1] WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *loc. cit.*, and EADMER, 61.

[2] "Decreta, dicens indignando, et institutiones sanctorum patrum minis actus unius hominis dissiparem!"—EADM.

[3] See his letter to the king, ap. EADM., 61.

[4] "Deo autem gratias quia in te semper episcopalis auctoritas perseverat. . . . Eumdem enim cum patribus nostris spiritum habentes credimus, propter quod et loquimur. Et verbum quidem Dei non est alligatum."—ANS., Ep. iii. 44, of 15th April 1102.

[5] "Si vult suæ videantur; meæ hac vice non videbuntur," &c.

Anselm hastened to communicate to the Parliament the letters written to him by the pope;[1] but, to destroy their effect, the king's three ambassadors declared on their word as bishops that the holy Father had charged them, with his own lips and in private, to tell the king that as long as he lived well he need not trouble himself about investitures; and that, if this concession was not made in writing, it was only lest other princes should be tempted to usurp the same privilege.[2] Anselm's messenger, Baldwin the monk, always zealous and bold,[3] formally denied that the pope could have said one thing and written another. The barons were much perplexed: some said they ought to believe the letters sealed with the papal seal, and agreeing with the report of the monks; others maintained, on the contrary, that they ought to give credence to the testimony of the three bishops, rather than to parchment stained with ink and sealed with lead—and they added, that in worldly affairs the affirmation of shavelings (*monachellorum*) who lived apart from the world ought to count for nothing.[4] "But," cried Baldwin, "this has nothing to do with worldly affairs." "No doubt," he was answered, "you are a learned and honest man, but it is much more fitting that we should believe an archbishop and two bishops than a mere monk such as you are!"

Baldwin insisted. "Do you pay no regard to the pope's letters?" he asked.

"What!" replied the king's supporters; "we refuse the testimony of monks against the bishops, and we are to accept that of these sheepskins!"

[1] Beside the letter from which we have quoted a passage, Anselm produced another, of December 12, 1101, given exactly by EADMER, in which Pascal reminds him of the condemnation of investitures at the Council of Bari, where they were both present.—FLEURY, b. lxv. No. 21.

[2] "Contestati sunt in episcopali veritate papam ipsum regi verbis puris mandasse per se . . . se clam illis alia egisse, palam alia."

[3] "Spiritu fervens et boni amans."

[4] "Trium potius episcoporum assertionibus quam vervecum pellibus atramento denigratis, plumbisque massula oneratis fore credendum . . objecto monachellorum testimonio."

"Alas!" returned the monks present, "is not the Gospel also written on sheepskins?"[1] Anselm, who dreaded scandal, would not openly contradict the assertions of the three bishops. He contented himself with sending a third embassy to Rome, to clear up the difficulty, and he wrote to the sovereign pontiff a letter which contained the following passage:—

"I fear neither exile, poverty, torture, nor death: my mind is prepared to endure all things, by God's help, rather than disobey the Apostolic See, or sacrifice the freedom of my mother the Church of Christ. I desire only to do my duty and to respect your authority. In the Council of Rome I heard our Lord Urban, of venerable memory, excommunicate all kings and laymen, without exception, who should give the investiture of churches, and all those who should receive it from their hands. Will your Holiness deign either to dispense England from the excommunication, so that I may be able to remain here without danger to my soul, or else send me word that you intend to maintain it whatever happens?"[2]

While awaiting an answer to this letter, the primate, with the permission of the king and the assistance of the prelates and barons, held at Westminster a national council, the first since the death of Lanfranc. The chief barons were present by Anselm's invitation. The council deposed six abbots convicted of simony, and published several decrees for securing the celibacy of the clergy and repressing various disorders. Selling men like cattle, which had hitherto been practised in England, was forbidden;[3] and an anathema was pro-

[1] "Ast hoc negotium seculare non est. . . . Et quidem te virum prudentem et strenuum scimus, sed ipse ordo expostulat. . . . Væ, væ, nonne et Evangelia pellibus ovinis inscribuntur!"

[2] "Non timeo exilium, non paupertatem . . . certitudinem tantum quæro. . . . Audivi in Romano concilio . . . excommunicari reges, &c. . . ."—Ep. iii. 73.

[3] "Ne quis illud nefarium negotium quo hactenus homines in Anglia solebant velut bruta animalia venundari, deinceps ullatenus facere præsumat."

nounced against the infamous debauchees whose misdeeds had rendered it necessary to forbid the wearing of hair below the ears."[1]

The archbishop had promised that during the truce rendered necessary by the new mission to Rome, he would not excommunicate those whom the king should invest with bishoprics; but neither would he consecrate them. Henry hastened to bestow a see upon his chancellor and his *larderer* or storekeeper.[2] On Anselm's refusal, Henry decided to have them consecrated by the Archbishop of York, together with William Giffard, who had been previously nominated to Winchester, and accepted by the metropolitan clergy. The ceremony was about to begin when Giffard, horrified by such iniquity,[3] declared that he would endure anything rather than take part in so great a

[1] Hume, that oracle of philosophical history in England, and other writers of his class, have jested on the importance attached by Anselm throughout his life to prohibitions against the *criniti*, or young men with long hair: they have affected to misunderstand the cause which then made this kind of coiffure the sign of the most monstrous excesses.—ORDER. VIT., vol. viii. p. 682. Those who have been in the East in our days know what to think. Many other illustrious bishops sprung from the Monastic Orders made themselves remarkable, like Anselm, for their zeal against the *criniti*. Godefroy, Bishop of Amiens, celebrating Christmas, and refusing to accept the offerings of those who were *intonsi*, induced the Count of Flanders and his knights to cut off their hair with their swords and poniards, for want of scissors. Serlon, first Abbot of St. Evroul, and afterwards Bishop of Séez, preaching on Easter Day at Carentan, where King Henry I. "*satis humiliter inter cistas rusticorum in imo loco sedebat*," all at once produced a pair of scissors from his robe, and cut the hair of the king and his knights. His sermon on this subject is quoted by ORDER. VITAL., b. xi. p. 816. He objected yet more to the beard than to the hair. "*In barba prolixa*," he said to the fine gentlemen of his time, "*hircis assimilantur. . . . In nutrimento autem comarum mulierum sequaces æstimantur. Barbas suas radere devitant, ne pili suas in oculis amicas præcisi pungant.*"

[2] *Larderarium.* This larderer, like the chancellor, was called Roger. The former, nominated to Hereford, died immediately after his elevation, and was replaced by Reinelm, chancellor to the queen, who, seeing that Anselm would not consecrate him, sent his crosier back to the king, who punished him for his noble conduct by exiling him from the Court.

[3] "Amore compunctus justitiæ mox inhorruit."

profanation. The crowd which filled the church shouted that William Giffard was right, and that the other candidates would not be bishops, but shameless ill-doers.[1]

The bishops, terrified and confused, went to the king to complain of the brave priest.[2] William was obliged to appear before the prince. Standing alone among courtiers, whose threats and insults could be heard on all sides, he remained immovable. Stripped of all that he possessed, he was driven from the kingdom.[3] Anselm interceded, but vainly, for the condemned, whose fate he was soon to share. But the primate uttered no complaint. Writing to an abbess of the same diocese as the exile, he said, "It is a greater glory for him, in the sight of God and good men, to be thus despoiled and proscribed for the sake of right, than to be endowed by wicked hands with all the riches of the world. Let his friends rejoice and exult that he has remained unchangeably faithful to the truth."[4]

When he thus spoke, the venerable prelate was but making beforehand his own panegyric, for the time was approaching when he also was to be attacked.

At Mid-Lent, 1103, the pope's answer to the assertions of the bishops having arrived, the king, according to his custom, refused to take any notice of it. "What have I to do with the pope," he said, "in my own affairs?"[5]

[1] "Totius multitudinis . . . clamor insonuit, una voce Wilhelmum recti amatorem, et episcopos non episcopos, sed justitiæ præcipitatores esse increpantes."

[2] "At illi mentis suæ rancorem ex vultus immutatione pandentes."

[3] "Ille stat, nec avelli potest a recto, et ideo suis omnibus expoliatus," &c.

[4] "Gaudeant igitur et exultent amici ejus," &c.—Ep. iii. 70. See also Ep. iii. 105, to William, to exhort him to continue in the right way: "Vos scitis quia Dominus reprobat consilia principum; consilium autem Domini manet in æternum."

[5] "Quid mihi de meis cum Papa? Hæc si quis mihi auferre voluerit, quod inimicus meus sit, omnis qui me diligit certissime noverit." Anselm replied: "Nihil eorum quæ ipsius esse scio ipsi tollo aut tollere volo. Verumtamen noverit quod nec pro redemptione capitis mei consentiam ei de iis quæ præsens audivi in Romano concilio prohiberi, nisi ab eadem sede," &c.—Eadm., 65.

Anselm on his side refused to open the letters from Rome without the king's consent, lest he should be accused of having altered them. Both, however, knew the contents beforehand. The difficulty, therefore, seemed insoluble. The discussions recommenced with more vehemence than ever: the great barons of the kingdom, the king's chief councillors, wept at the thought of the evils reserved for England in the future; pious men offered up the most ardent prayers. Suddenly the king proposed to Anselm that he himself should be sent to Rome to end the dispute. Parliament eagerly approved the idea. But the archbishop at once understood that this was a trick to make him quit the country.[1] Nevertheless he consented, in spite of his weakness and his great age—for he was then seventy—and said to his friends, "You may be assured that if I can reach the pope, I will advise nothing that is contrary to my honour or the freedom of the Churches."[2]

On April 27, 1103, Anselm embarked. Having landed, he hurried to his dear Abbey of Bec, where he opened the pope's letters. There, as he expected, he found the withering disavowal of the bishops' falsehood, and also the sentence of excommunication issued by the pope against them for perjury.[3]

The heat of summer past, the primate travelled towards Rome, where he was lodged by Pascal as he had been by his predecessor, in the Lateran. There, as in the time of

[1] The Anglican writer in *The British Critic* thinks, with what appears good reason, that Henry feared the increasing influence of Anselm over the rest of the episcopate, and that this fear was justified by the noble conduct of the two bishops Reinelm and William, who had resigned their dignity. The king therefore wished that the archbishop should leave England, but not that he should arrive at Rome.—Cf. Ep. iii. 86.

[2] "Noveritis quod ipse nihil quod vel Ecclesiarum libertati, vel meæ possit obviare honestati, meo faciet . . . consilio."

[3] "Episcopos qui veritatem in mendacio invocarunt, ipsa veritate quæ Deus est in medium introducta, a B. Petri gratia et a nostra societate excludimus, donec Romanæ Ecclesiæ satisfaciant, et reatus sui pondus oscant."

Urban II., he met William Warelwast,[1] who had been the agent of William Rufus, and who now, appointed Bishop of Exeter by Henry I., came to plead the cause of the latter. This Warelwast understood the art of mingling threats with arguments;[2] and thus, as formerly, he succeeded in gaining the suffrages of many personages of the Roman Court, who declared loudly, after hearing the Englishman's skilful pleading, "that it was advisable to yield to the wishes of so powerful a sovereign as the King of England."

Neither Anselm nor the pope said a word. Encouraged by their silence, William ended his speech thus: "Whatever any one may say, let all here present know that my lord the King of England will never consent to renounce the right of investitures, even if it should cost him his crown!"

"And for my part," instantly replied the sovereign pontiff, "I declare before God that Pope Pascal will never allow your king to possess the right of investiture, even if his refusal should cost him his head!"[3]

The Romans applauded this speech. As for the pope, while remaining steady in his refusal, he thought fit to address a conciliatory letter to the king, in which he said that he exempted him from the personal excommunication, but that he strictly adhered to the sentence against all bishops who should receive investiture from him.[4]

[1] "Notus jam Romæ."—WILL. MALMES.

[2] He was also intrusted with a threatening letter from Henry, in which the king said that while he lived the dignity of the English crown should never be lowered; that, even if he himself would submit, the barons and people would not; and that he ought not to be forced against his will into disobedience to the pope.—BROMPTON ap. TWYSDEN, *Hist. anglic. script.* i. p. 999.

[3] "Erupit et ait . . . nec pro amissione regni sui passurum se perdere investituras Ecclesiarum. . . . Si . . . rex tuus . . . scias, ecce coram Deo dico, quia nec pro redemptione sui capitis eas illi aliquando Paschalis papa impune permittet habere."

[4] Ap. EADMER, 67. He said to him, among other arguments: "Dices itaque: Mei hoc juris est. Non utique, non est imperatorium, non est regium, sed divinum. Solius Illius est qui dicit: *Ego sum ostium.* Unde

Anselm then quitted Italy, furnished with pontifical letters which confirmed him in all the rights of his primacy. The great Countess Matilda, who had several times warmly recommended the prelate to the holy Father, escorted him across the Apennines.[1] When he arrived at Lyons, towards Christmas, Warelwast, who had rejoined him on the road, communicated to him the message which the king had directed to be given to him in case the pope would yield nothing. "The king," said Warelwast, "will welcome your return to England if you will live with him as your predecessors did with his."

"Is that all?" asked the primate.

"I speak to a man of understanding," replied William.

"Say no more; I understand," said Anselm,[2] and from that moment firmly resolved to remain at Lyons, where his old friend Archbishop Hugh again offered him a most honourable resting-place.[3]

Here the primate spent sixteen months.[4] The king did not fail to seize for his own use all the revenues of the see of Canterbury, and he sent to Anselm a written order not to return to his diocese until he should have promised to obey the ancient customs. This new exile of the archbishop was the signal for a dreadful outbreak of evil in England; rapine, sacrilege, the oppression of the poor by the nobles, violation of sanctuary, abduction of virgins, incestuous marriages, and especially the marriage of priests—all these

pro ipso rogo te, cujus hoc munus est, ut ipsi hoc reddas. Ipsi dimittas cujus amori etiam quæ tua sunt debes. Nos autem cur tuæ obniteremur voluntati, cur obsisteremus gratiæ, nisi Dei in hujus negotii consensu sciremus voluntati obviare, gratiam amittere. . . . Revoca pastorem tuum, revoca patrem tuum," &c.

[1] "Nos, ductu gloriosæ comitissæ per Alpes euntes."—EADM., 67; ANS., Ep. iv. 442. See Ep. iv. 37, where he thanks her for this service, and sends her his *Meditations*.

[2] "Ne amplius dices: prudenti loquor. . . . Scio quid dicas et intelligo."

[3] "Ibi ut Pater et Dominus loci ab omnibus habitus."

[4] December 1103 to April 1105.

disorders took free course, and desolated the land.[1] Good Catholics blamed Anselm, reproaching him with having abandoned his flock, and fled before a word spoken by "a certain William,"[2] while his sheep were at the mercy of wolves. They threatened him with the last judgment; they reminded him bitterly of the example of Ambrose resisting Theodosius to his face;[3] they declared that he was responsible for the ruin and the shame of the Church of England, which he was sacrificing to trifles.[4]

The monks of Canterbury were not the least bitter in their complaints. No trial was spared to the great archbishop, and perhaps none was more cruel than this injustice of good men. It was easy for him to justify himself, and he did it strongly and with a good conscience.[5] "There are people," he wrote to one of his monks, "who say that it is I who forbid investiture to the king, I who, unresisting, leave the Churches a prey to perverted clergy. Tell these people that they lie.[6] It was certainly not I who invented the prohibition relative to investiture; but I heard the pope in full council excommunicate those who should give or receive this investiture: now I will not, by communicating with these excommunicated persons, become excommunicated myself. As to resisting corrupted priests, I have done it so often, that it is for that very cause that I am exiled, robbed of all things, and ruined."

[1] "Damna Ecclesiarum ita ut locus corporis et sanguinis Domini libertatem amittat . . . et quodque omnium primum malum est, ad dedecus honestatis nostræ, sacerdotis uxores ducere."—EADMER, *Hist. nov.*, b. iv. p. 69.

[2] "Pro uno verbo cujusdam Wilhelmi."

[3] "Tunc fortassis fugisse pudebit cum videris ante tribunal Christi ducentes choros animarum illos fortissimos gregis divini arietes, quibus nec lupus nocuit, nec alicujus terror in fugam vertit. Quam beata erit tunc memoria. . . . Ambrosii," &c.

[4] "Totius Anglorum Ecclesiæ ac legis christianæ quotidiana diminutio et summa destructio. . . . Quando vos qui talibus obviare constituti estis, pro nihilo . . . abestis."

[5] Ep. iii. 89, 90, 91, 100, 101.

[6] "Dic eis quia mentiuntur."—Ep. iii. 100.

In the midst of his exile the primate watched with tender and active care over the interests of his diocese and his monks, over the education of the pupils of the monasteries, and the poor whom he was accustomed to aid.[1] He chiefly depended in these matters upon Gondulphus of Rochester, whose see was nearest to Canterbury, and who had never betrayed the old friendship formed at Bec. To this faithful friend, the only English bishop who had not deserted him, Anselm pointed out, as follows, the conduct in which he must remain steadfast:—

"Let no threat, no promise, no artifice, entrap you into any homage or oath whatever. If they try to force you, answer, '*I am a Christian, I am a monk, I am a bishop, and therefore I am determined to remain faithful to my obligations to all without neglecting my duty to any.*' Say neither more nor less than this."[2] And as to what concerned himself, he added: "Know that I hope, and am resolved, to do nothing contrary to my honour as a bishop in order to return to England; I would rather be at enmity with men than be reconciled to them by being at enmity with God."[3]

Meantime Henry was strongly urged to change his mind, and restore order by recalling Anselm. Queen Matilda, a pious and enlightened princess,[4] to whom her people had given the name of *The Good*,[5] showed herself anxious to

[1] "De pauperibus quod apud Cantuariam pascere debeo, rogo multum ne ullam patiantur inopiam."—Ep. iv. 33. See his active correspondence on these affairs with Prior Ernulf of Canterbury, and with GONDULPHUS, b. iii. and iv. *passim*.

[2] "Hæc sit vestra responsio: Christianus sum, monachus sum, episcopus sum: et ideo omnibus volo fidem servare secundum quod unicuique debeo . . . his verbis nec addatis quicquam, nec minuatis."—Ep. iii. 92.

[3] "Hoc autem scitote . . . contra episcopalem honestatem. . . . Malo hominibus non concordare, quam illis concordando, a Deo discordare."

[4] GUILL. JEMMETIC, viii. 10; GUILL. MALMESB., *De gest. reg.*, b. i.; SELDEN., *Not. in Ans.*, 576.

[5] Mold the god queen.—ROB. OF GLOCESTER; ROB. OF BRUNNE, ap. Thierry.

bring about an agreement. She was tenderly attached to Anselm, who had married and crowned her; she admired the great athlete of God, the vanquisher of nature;[1] she had formerly trembled for his life when she saw him exhausted by daily fasts.[2] "You must eat and drink," she wrote to him, "for you have still a great journey before you, a great harvest to gather into the barns of the Lord, and few labourers to help you. Remember that you fill the place of John, the beloved apostle, who survived his Master that he might take care of the Virgin-Mother. You have to take care of our mother the Church, where, every day, destruction threatens the brethren and sisters of Christ, whom He has bought with His blood, and intrusted to you."[3]

It was not by senile indulgence that Anselm had gained Matilda's heart; he, indeed, answered her caressing letters by exhortations which set forth strongly the duties of royalty: "You are queen, not by me, but by Christ. Would you thank Him worthily for this gift? Consider then who is the queen whom He has chosen in this world for His bride, and whom He has so loved as to give His life for her. See her exiled, wandering, almost widowed; see how she sighs, with her children, for the return of that Bridegroom who will one day come back from His distant kingdom, and render to every one the good or the evil they have done to His beloved. Whosoever has honoured her, shall be honoured with her; whoever has trampled her under foot, shall be trampled under foot far from her; whoever has exalted her, shall be exalted with the angels, and

[1] "Tanto patri cujus sum beneficiis obligata: tam forti Dei athletæ et humanæ naturæ victori."—Ep. iii. 55.

[2] She was grieved to perceive that his voice was failing: "*Vox spiritualium ædificatrix vanescat, et quæ canorum et dulce Dei verbum*," &c. He could no longer be heard from a distance when he preached.

[3] "Comedendum est vobis et bibendum quoniam . . . grandis messis seminanda, sarculanda ac metenda, in horreo . . . atque quotidie periclitabuntur fratres et sorores Christi."—*Ibid.*

whoever has humbled her, shall be humbled among the devils." [1]

Possessed by this teaching, Matilda could not console herself for Anselm's banishment; she wrote to the pope to implore him to send back to England her father and comforter; [2] above all, she wrote to Anselm with the frankness and simplicity of a loving daughter: "My good lord, my revered father, be persuaded; let that heart, which I dare to call a heart of iron, be softened. Come and visit your people, and your handmaid who sighs for you. I have found a means by which neither your pastoral rights nor those of the royal majesty need be sacrificed, even if they cannot harmonise. Let the father return to his daughter, the master to his servant, and teach her what she ought to do. Come before I die, for even though I speak amiss, I will say that I fear lest if I die without seeing you I should be without joy in heaven itself. You are my joy, my hope, and my refuge. Without you my soul is a land without water; therefore I hold out my hands to you in supplication that you would refresh it by the sweet dew of your affection." [3]

Anselm's answer, though negative,[4] gave the queen the liveliest pleasure. "Your words," she wrote to him, "have dispersed the cloud of sadness which surrounded me, as the rays of morning disperse the shades of night. I kiss this letter from my father; I press it closely to my heart; I continually read and meditate that dear writing which speaks to me in secret, and which promises the return

[1] "Qui hanc honorant, cum illa honorabuntur; qui hanc conculcant . . . qui hanc deprimunt, cum dæmonibus deprimentur."—Ep. iii. 57.

[2] Ep. iii. 99.

[3] "Veni, Domine, et visita servam tuam; veni . . . lacrymas absterge. . . . Flecte, bone Domine, pie Pater . . . et ferreum pace tua dixerim pectus amolli. . . . Inveni viam qua nec tu pastor . . . nec regiæ majestatis jura solvantur. . . . Veniat ad filiam pater, ad ancillam dominus. . . . Improbe loquar: timeo ne mihi etiam in illa terra viventium et lætantium omnis exultandi præcidatur occasio."—Ep. iii. 93.

[4] I suppose this answer to be Ep. 107 of book iii.

of the father to his daughter, the lord to his servant, the shepherd to his sheep." [1]

The aged pontiff received also letters from the king, but of a less tender character, and to which he sent the following reply: "Your letter expresses your friendship for me, and tells me that if I would live with you as Lanfranc did with your father, you would willingly love me better than any one else in your kingdom. For your friendship I thank you; but I answer that neither at my baptism nor at any of my ordinations have I promised to obey the laws or customs of your father or of Lanfranc; it is to the law of God that I owe submission. I would indeed rather serve you than any other mortal prince. But I will not at any price deny the law of God. And, moreover, I neither can nor ought to conceal from you that God will demand from you an account, not only of the royalty, but also of the primacy of England. This double load will crush you. There is no man to whom it is more needful than to a king that he should obey God's laws, or who incurs more danger in breaking them. It is not I but Holy Scripture which says, '*Potentes potenter tormenta patientur, ei fortioribus fortior instat cruciatus.*' I see in your letter only a temporising which is not good either for your soul or the Church of God. If you still hesitate, I, who am not defending my own cause, but that which God has intrusted to me, I dare not delay to appeal to the Lord. Do not then force me to say against my will, 'Arise, O Lord, and judge Thine own cause.'" [2]

[1] "Tristitiæ nebulis expulsis . . . tanquam novæ lucis radius. Chartulam . . . loco patris amplector, sinu foveo, cordi quoad possum propius admoveo. . . . Ea namque frequenter secretoque consulens spondet filiæ reditum patris, ancillæ domini, ovi pastoris."—Ep. iii. 96. She adds that her husband is less angry than he is reported to be, and that she will do her best to soften him. Anselm answers that God does not make the wife responsible for the sins of her husband.—Ep. iii. 97. See other equally tender letters from the queen, Ep. iii. 119; iv. 74, 76.

[2] "De amicitia et de bona voluntate gratias ago. . . . Respondeo quod neque in baptismo, neque in aliqua ordinatione mea promisi me servaturum

It was the first time the mild Anselm had thus spoken. This was in April 1105. The pope had hitherto contented himself with excommunicating the Count de Meulan, the king's chief minister.[1] Anselm saw plainly that he must not hope for more decisive measures in this quarter.[2] The kings of France, Philip and his son Louis, who had been associated in the kingdom since 1099, and Manasses, the Archbishop of Rheims, invited him in the most affectionate terms to come to France.[3] He left Lyons therefore to go to Rheims. Having arrived at Charité-sur-Loire, he heard of the serious illness of Adela, Countess of Blois,[4] sister of King Henry, who had always assisted him during his exile, and he did not hesitate to turn out of his way to go and console her. But, on his arrival, he found her almost recovered, and did not conceal from her that it was his intention to excommunicate her brother. The report of this project soon spread, and gave great delight to Henry's numerous enemies,[5] for he was at this moment in arms to rob his brother Robert of Normandy. As the kings of France would certainly not fail to seize such an opportunity

legem vel consuetudinem patris vestri vel Lanfranci, sed legem Dei et omnium ordinum quos suscepi. . . . Nulli homini magis expedit quam regi se subdere legi Dei, et nullus periculosius se subtrahit a lege ejus. . . . Exurge, Deus, judica causam tuam."—Ep. iii. 95. *The laws of Lanfranc!* Just as writers in our own days have said, *the doctrines of Bossuet.* As we may see, the enemies of the Church do not change their tactics; the Norman conquerors, like the Gallican legists, sought to arm themselves with the individual and always ill-interpreted authority of one doctor against the general and perpetual authority of the head of the Church. Anselm was not to be so misled.

[1] At the Lateran Council. See his letter of March 26th to Anselm

[2] EADMER, 70.

[3] *Ibid.*, Ep. iv. 50, 51.

[4] This pious princess, daughter of the Conqueror, and ancestress of the famous race of the Counts of Champagne, afterwards became a nun at Marcigny, which St. Hugh of Cluny had founded to receive ladies of the highest rank. See b. i.

[5] "Jam enim in multis locis per Angliam, Franciam et Normanniam fama vulgaverat regem proxime excommunicandum, et idcirco ei utpote potestati non adeo amatæ multa male struebantur, quæ illi a tanto viro excommunicato facilius inferenda putabantur."—EADM., 71.

of weakening their redoubtable neighbour, Henry became uneasy, and begged his sister to act as mediatrix. And finally, an interview took place, July 22, 1105, at Laigle, where the king showed great consideration and humility towards Anselm,[1] and promised to restore to the archbishop not only his own favour, but also the revenues of the see of Canterbury. In spite of this apparent reconciliation, Anselm would not return to England until another embassy sent to Rome should have definitely arranged, on both sides, the various points in dispute between the king and the primate. But, with his usual bad faith, Henry, no longer in fear of excommunication, delayed this embassy by all sorts of devices, hoping to entrap the archbishop into communicating with the bishops who had received investiture from the royal hand.[2] Moreover, as he needed money to continue the war in Normandy, the king, after having recourse to the shameful extortions habitual with his family, bethought himself of transforming into a source of revenue the canon promulgated by Anselm and the last council of London to enforce the celibacy of priests. He did not even stop there; taking in hand the defence of ecclesiastical morality, he levied heavy fines upon all priests who had married during the archbishop's absence. At first the guilty were made to pay. But to procure the sums required, the innocent were soon confounded with the guilty, blameless priests with those who had broken the law. Finally, the parish priests were all taxed, and those who could not or would not pay were imprisoned. The state of things was most wretched.[3] Two hundred priests, in alb and stole, went one day barefoot to beg the king's mercy; but he ordered them to be driven from his presence. The mischief reached such a height that even the bishops who had given

[1] "Quoties erat aliquid inter illos agendum sempe ripsum ire ad Anselmum."

[2] EADMER, p. 72, gives the letter in which Henry tries to excuse his delay, and the energetic complaints of Anselm both regarding the king and the Count de Meulan.

[3] "Erat ergo miseriam videre."

up the Church's liberty to the king, were driven to claim Anselm's support.[1] After enduring all sorts of trials, the brave pontiff was to experience all sorts of reparation; six bishops, among whom were the three prevaricators already spoken of, who had falsified the account of the decision made at Rome, wrote to the eloquent champion of the Church to implore his assistance. "There is no peace for us," they said; "arise, therefore, as Matathias did of old. . . . Your children will fight with you; we are ready not only to follow you but even to go before if you command. . . . For we will seek in this affair not our own interests, but those of God."[2] Anselm answered: "I am sorry for your sufferings, but I congratulate you on that episcopal constancy which you promise to display. You see at last to what your patience, if I may call it so, has led.[3] But I will not answer you more precisely until the return of our envoys from Rome, for the king will not support me in England unless I consent to violate the apostolical decrees." Nevertheless, he wrote to Henry to represent to him that it was unheard of for a king to usurp the rights of bishops by inflicting temporal punishment for crimes committed against the laws of the Church. The primate added that the cognisance and punishment of such crimes belonged to his jurisdiction, and that it would not be enough to restore to him his territorial possessions and his revenues without the restitution also of his spiritual authority.[4] Henry promised him satisfaction, and pretended that he had acted only in the archbishop's interest.

[1] "Ipsi episcopi qui semper libertatem Ecclesiæ et Anselmum . . . cum principe deprimere nisi sunt. . . ."—EADM., 73.

[2] "Sustinuimus pacem et ipsa longe recessit. . . . Exsurge ut olim senex ille Mathathias. . . . Nos enim jam in hac causa non quæ nostra, sed quæ Dei sunt quærimus."—Ep. iii. 121.

[3] "Bonum est et gratum mihi quia tandem cognoscitis ad quid vos perduxit, ut mitius dicam, vestra patientia."—Ep. iii. 122.

[4] "Quod hactenus inauditum et inusitatum est in Ecclesia Dei de ullo rege et de aliquo principe. . . . Plus sum episcopus spiritali cura quam terrena possessione."—Ep. iii. 109.

At last, in the spring of 1106, the envoys returned from Rome. It was William Warelwast on the king's part, and on Anselm's, Baldwin the monk, who had been charged to fight out this long battle between the despotic royalty of England and the ancient liberties of the Church.[1] They were commissioned to give to Anselm the sentence of the pope, who, without yielding in essentials, was willing to respond to the king's submission by some concessions. "He who gives his hand to a man lying down can only do so by bending; but however low he may bend, he does not lose his natural height."[2] The holy Father maintained the prohibition against investiture, but he authorised Anselm to absolve and ordain those who should have done homage to the king, until, by the help of God's grace, the archbishop should succeed in persuading the prince to abandon so unreasonable a pretension.[3]

Anselm, whose only desire was to obey the law, did not oppose this provisional concession, nor insist upon the question of homage, although that had been forbidden by Urban II. at the councils of Claremont and Rome, together with investiture.[4] The king went to visit the prelate at Bec; they kept the feast of the Assumption together, and so sealed their reconciliation. The king renounced his arbitrary exactions from the parish priests, as well as the revenues of vacant churches, and the tax which William Rufus had levied on all in common. Anselm then returned to England, after a second exile of more than three years: he was received with transports of joy; and Queen Matilda, who at last saw her prayers granted, hurried to meet the

[1] "Pro causa quæ inter regem Anglorum et me, imo inter illum et libertatem Ecclesiæ pro qua sum exul . . . et spoliatus."—Ep. iv. 48.

[2] "Qui enim stans jacenti ad sublevandum manum porrigit nunquam jacentem eriget nisi et ipse curvetur. . . . Statum tandem rectitudinis non amittit."

[3] "Donec per omnipotentis gratiam ad hoc omittendum cor regium tuæ prædicationis imbribus molliatur." This letter is of March 23, 1106.

[4] The king set a special value on the homage. See the letter of Anselm to Hugh of Lyons on this subject, Ep. iii. 123, and Hugh's reply.

primate, whose lodging she had herself ordered to be prepared. The collectors of the revenue then disappeared from the churches and monasteries.

Henry had remained in Normandy, where shortly afterwards he gained the brilliant victory of Tenchbrai, which made him master both of the dukedom and of his brother's person. Public opinion attributed the victory to the king's reconciliation with the primate.[1] At the council of London (August 1, 1107) the clauses of the treaty were solemnly discussed between Henry, the bishops, the abbots, and the barons. More than one was found, both among the courtiers and the ill-reputed clergy, ready to urge the king to claim as a right, after the example of his father and brother, the privilege of granting investiture by the crosier; but the minds of the prince's chief advisers had undergone a happy change. Warelwast himself had returned from his last journey to Rome entirely devoted to the freedom of the Church.[2] The Count of Meulan, who had been first excommunicated, and then, while still under the weight of this sentence, converted by the energetic remonstrances of Yves of Chartres,[3] had applied to the pope and Anselm, and obtained leave to return to the communion of the faithful on condition that he should urge the king to submit to the decision of the holy Father.[4] The minister kept his word, and became from that time the ardent defender of ecclesiastical liberties in the royal councils.[5]

By his advice and that of Ralph de Rivers,[6] the king

[1] "Igitur ob pacem quam rex fecerat cum Anselmo hac victoria eum potitum multi testati sunt."—EADM., 76. Robert was not much better than Henry with regard to the rights of the Church, according to the complaints made of him by Yves of Chartres.

[2] "Erat enim tunc jam ad libertatem Ecclesiæ Dei cor habens."—EADM., 75.

[3] YVON. Ep. 154, ed. Juret.

[4] Ep. iii. 110, iv. 73.

[5] EADM., 78. Towards this time he introduced monks of Bec at Meulan —MABILL., *Ann.*, b. lxx. c. 9.

[6] *De Redueris?* Anselm, in his letter to Pascal, bears the same testimony to both.

declared, in presence of Anselm and of a multitude transported with joy,[1] that from henceforth no one should receive from the hand of the sovereign, or any other layman, the investiture of bishopric or abbey by crosier and ring;[2] and Anselm declared on his side that he would no longer refuse consecration to any prelate who had done homage to the king,[3] as he had thought right to refuse it in the reign of William.

The king, then, according to these stipulations, and by the advice of Anselm and the barons, provided priests for those English churches which were vacant, and for several of the Norman ones which were in the same condition. On one day Anselm consecrated five bishops, among whom were William of Winchester and Reinelm of Hereford, who, like him, and through him, had endured disgrace and exile for having opposed the king's will.

Thus, then, the old monk was victorious. The weak old sheep, as he had called himself, had ended by prevailing over the ungovernable bulls yoked with him to the plough of the English Church. Rufus and Beauclerc had vainly turned upon the primate all the batteries of force and of policy. The venerable churchman, without yielding a step, had survived the one, and brought the other to terms.

Warlike barons, politic clerks, indefatigable advocates, servile and disingenuous bishops had all failed, together with the kings whose docile instruments they were. It had come to be necessary to lay down the arms of William the Conqueror at the feet of this foreign monk, who, while still young, had been able by his mere presence to restrain the Norman prince. Fourteen years of struggle, persecution,

[1] "Astante multitudine."—EADM., 76; PETR. BLES., *in contin.* INGULPHI, p. 126.

[2] "Ut ab eo tempore in reliquum nunquam per dationem baculi pastoralis vel annuli quisquam episcopatu vel abbatia per regem vel quamlibet laicam manum investiretur in Anglia."—EADM., 76.

[3] We may see by various instances that the new bishops did homage to the primate as well as to the king.—EADM., 79.

exile, spoliation, intrigue, falsehood, meanness, and cruelty had not exhausted the brave old man; feebly supported by the papal councillors, betrayed by his episcopal colleagues, he had endured all things, and not a single sword had been drawn in his defence. It must be acknowledged, however, that the question thus litigated was, though serious, so obscure that modern wisdom has ventured to pronounce it equally puerile and unintelligible.

At the end of the battle, as at its commencement, Anselm still said: "I would rather die, or wear out my life in exile and in misery, than see the honour of the Church of God wounded on my account or by my example."[1] The victory which justly remained with the Archbishop of Canterbury was, if not complete, at least striking, important, and popular.[2]

The mere fact of such a contest and its long duration had been a true triumph for the Church; the glory she thus won was due to her, not only because the treaty of London was the first instance since the commencement of the struggle by Gregory VII. of a concession made by a vanquished opponent; not only because the most powerful of European kings renounced the symbols which the Emperor

[1] "Malo mori et quandiu vivam omni penuria in exilio gravari quam ut videam honestatem Ecclesiæ Dei, causa mei aut meo exemplo, ullo modo violari." Recommendation sent to his agent at Rome in 1106.—Ep. iv. 48.

[2] Such, at least, was the opinion of Eadmer, who was little disposed to concession (*Victoriam de libertate Ecclesiæ pro qua diu laboraverat, Anselmus adeptus est*, p. 25), and of Cardinal Hugh of Lyons, the most zealous champion of the Church and most devoted instrument of Gregory VII.: "Comperio quod illud propter quod assequendum tantopere hactenus laborastis . . . per Dei gratiam jam tandem ex magna parte assecuti estis."—Ad ANS., Ep. iii. 124. He begs him to yield on the question of homage. The Gallican historian, St. Marc, says: "Pascal, in his letter, did not grant the king the right to oblige bishops and abbots to do him homage for their fiefs; he only advised the archbishop not to consecrate those who should be found to have done this homage, and charges him to persuade the king not to exact it again. By this means the decree of Urban II. remained unbroken. . . . Thus, in this accommodation, Rome appeared to yield something, while in reality she yielded nothing."—*Hist. d'Italie*, vol. iv. p. 969.

of Germany refused to give up; not only because the unfaithful bishops were obliged to implore absolution, and the faithful permitted to receive consecration at the hands of the most devoted champion of the Holy See; but she triumphed, above all, in the lesson given to the contemporary world and to Catholic posterity by the heroic patience, the invincible gentleness, the unfailing energy of a poor Italian monk, who, first as a Norman abbot and afterwards as the English primate, had filled all the West with the brilliance of his glory and the fame of his courage. Doubtless, even after investiture was abandoned, the royal influence over elections remained preponderant; but it was impossible for this abandonment not to reawaken at once, in chapters and monasteries, the sense of their rights, and in kings the consciousness of the terrible responsibility which weighed upon them.[1]

Anselm survived the council of London but a short time. He devoted the remnant of his life to healing the wounds suffered by the country during the contest between the Church and the Crown. He took part in the measures devised by the king for the suppression of coining, and also of the odious oppressions with which the royal agents loaded the people. The king supported him strongly in his resolution to reform discipline, enforce celibacy, and maintain the rights of the primacy of Canterbury, disregarded by the Metropolitan of York.[2] Henry, during his absence from England, intrusted to Anselm the government

[1] "In personis eligendis nullatenus propria utitur volontate, sed religiosorum se penitus committit consilio," wrote Anselm to the pope in 1108.—Ep. iii. 181. "Rex antecessorum suorum usu relicto, nec personas quæ in regimen Ecclesiarum sumebantur per se elegit, nec," &c.—EADM., *Vit. Anselm.*, 25. "Electiones prælatorum omnibus collegiis libere concessit."—PETR. BLESENS., *in contin.* INGULPH., p. 126. Herr Franck and even Dr. Lingard think there was no essential change. The *British Critic* has successfully refuted this assertion, vol. xxxii. pp. 122-126. We refer for the last time to this work as the best account we know of the results of this contest.

[2] EADM., 78-84.

of his kingdom and family.[1] In one of his last letters, the archbishop tells Pope Pascal that the King of England was astonished that the head of the Church did not excommunicate the sovereign of Germany on account of his maintenance of investitures in the empire. Anselm, on this point, advised the pope not to destroy on one side what he had built up on the other.[2]

The primate was preceded to the tomb by his faithful friend Gondulphus of Rochester, whose funeral he celebrated.[3] Himself for many years the victim of frequent and most painful disease, the good old man persevered none the less in habits of prayer and of monastic austerities. Little by little he fell into a state of complete weakness, and at the beginning of Holy Week 1109, was in extremity. Medieval sovereigns were accustomed to hold courts at Easter, and to preside there, wearing their crowns. On the morning of Palm Sunday, a monk said to the primate, "Father, it seems to us that you are about to leave the world to appear at the Easter court of your Lord."[4] "I wish it," replied Anselm; "and yet I should thank Him if He would leave me with you long enough to finish a work which I have in my mind on the origin of the soul."[5] When his last moment approached, they laid the dying man on haircloth and ashes. There he breathed his last sigh, surrounded by his monks, on the Wednesday of Holy Week,

[1] Ep. iv. 93.

[2] "Ideo minatur sine dubio se resumpturum suas investituras, quoniam ille suas tenet in pace . . . Rex enim noster diligenter inquirit quod de illo rege facitis."—Ep. iii. 182.

[3] "Ut monachus, non ut episcopus mori cupiens, in domum infirmorum se deferri jussit, ut inter monachorum manus spiritum redderet."—MABILL., b. lxxi. c. 69.

[4] "Domine Pater . . . ad paschalem Domini tui curiam, relicto sæculo, vadis."—EADM., 25.

[5] "Verum si mallet me adhuc inter vos saltem tamdiu manere, donec quæstionem quam de animæ origine mente revolvo, alsolvere possem, gratiosus acciperem, eo quod nescio utrum aliquis cam me defuncto sit absoluturus."

April 21, 1109, at the age of 76. In what lively colours does the prelate's last wish, his regret at being unable to finish a philosophical work, paint for us the active mind and firm will of the immortal philosopher! History offers no other example of a man sharing in such violent and multiplied contests, yet remaining throughout devoted to such metaphysical speculations as seem to require an undisturbed mind and a life of external calm.[1] Amidst so much commotion and trouble, Anselm carried on side by side his theological and philosophical researches, and a correspondence of immense extent. In such a man no doubt the uprightness and simplicity of his soul doubled the powers of his intellect. His range of thought was as wide as his courage was invincible. Care for the good of individual souls was as powerful with him as his ardent zeal for the interests of the universal Church. Amidst the deepest tribulations of all kinds, Anselm guided with most scrupulous attention the conduct of his sister, his brother-in-law, and of his nephew whom he had the happiness of drawing into the cloister.[2] With that tenderness of heart which was a secret of his time, he was neither limited to the narrow sphere of family life nor the wider one of a special church. He governed the consciences of a vast number of pious women, monks, and foreigners.[3] Sometimes he wrote to the Archbishop of Lund, in Denmark, to instruct him in some point of discipline;[4] sometimes to the Bishop of St. Jago, in Galicia, to promise him his prayers against the Saracens;[5] sometimes to the Bishop of Naumbourg, in Germany, to reproach him for following, in

[1] After his return from exile he wrote a treatise on the harmony between free-will and grace, the divine presence and predestination.

[2] See his touching letters to his family.—Ep. iii. 63, 66, 67, &c.

[3] See Ep., *passim*, especially b. iii. 133, 137, 138. In the latter is this fine thought: "Vita præsens via est. Nam quamdiu homo vivit, non facit nisi ire; semper enim aut ascendit, aut descendit. Aut ascendit in cœlum, aut descendit in infernum."

[4] Ep. iv. 90, and suppl. Ep. 10, ed. Gerberon.

[5] Ep. iv. 19.

opposition to the Holy See, the party of the successor of Nero and of Julian the Apostate.[1] He interceded with the Kings of Ireland and Scotland in the interest of law and morality.[2] He sent prayers and meditations to the great Countess Matilda;[3] he guided the steps of the Countess Ida of Boulogne in the perfect way, and every day, as he told her, he recalled her to his memory.[4] In the north, he commended to the Earl of Orkney the care of his subjects' souls;[5] in the south, he urged upon Marquis Humbert respect for the maternal rights of the Church.[6] He congratulated Count Robert of Flanders on having spontaneously renounced investitures, and having thus separated himself from those who, disobeying the vicar of Peter, could not be counted among that flock which God had intrusted to him. "Let them seek," he said, "some other door into heaven, for they will certainly not enter by that of which the Apostle St. Peter holds the keys."[7] Then crossing the seas in thought, the pontiff went to salute the new Christian royalty that had risen beside the Holy Sepulchre, and to remind King Baldwin of Jerusalem of this too-much-forgotten truth: "God loves nothing in the world better than the freedom of His Church. He will not have His Bride a slave."[8] These last words might have served as motto to the great monk who has been justly regarded as the flower

[1] Ep. iii. 134, on sending him a consultation on the difference between the Roman and Greek Churches. This Bishop of Naumbourg was that Valeranus, whose imperialist pleading, addressed to Count Louis of Thuringia, we have already mentioned. He changed his opinions, and became secretary of the College of Cardinals. He informed Anselm of this, who congratulated him, and sent him a second work.

[2] Ep. iii. 132, 142, 147.

[3] See *supra*.

[4] "Charissima, vos salutat mea epistola, sed quotidie vos aspicit mea memoria."—Ep. iii. 56; see in addition, b. ii. 24, 27; b. iii. 18, 56.

[5] Ep. iv. 92.

[6] Ep. iii. 65.

[7] "Quærat igitur ille alias regni cœlorum portas: quia per illas non intrabit quarum claves Petrus apostolus portat."—Ep. iv. 13.

[8] "Nihil magis diligit Deus in hoc mundo quam libertatem Ecclesiæ suæ. . . . Liberam vult esse Deus sponsam suam, non ancillam."—Ep. iv. 9.

of medieval goodness, and whom the Almighty[1] seems to have sent as herald before the martyr of the thirteenth century, his fifth successor in the see of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket.

[1] "Flos bonorum . . . heros sacer."—ORDER. VIT., b. xi. 839. Shortly after his death he became the object of common invocation in case of danger. See the instance of Earl Roger of Montgomery, quoted by Eadmer, p. 214, in *suppl. ad calc.*, ed. Gerberon.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHURCH IN CONFLICT WITH THE EVIL PASSIONS OF KINGS

The Council of Poitiers assembled to condemn the King of France.—Heroism of Bernard, Abbot of St. Cyprian, of Robert d'Arbrissel, and of the legate Jean.—Repentance and penance of the Duke of Aquitaine.—Unconquerable energy of Yves of Chartres.—His daring frankness in his relations with the pope.—Moderation and firmness of Yves of Chartres in the struggle between the two powers.—He ventures to remonstrate with the pope.—What happened to Jerusalem and the Crusaders after the death of Godefroy de Bouillon.—Bohemond, Prince of Antioch, marries the daughter of the French king, and preaches the Crusade at Notre Dame de Chartres, and afterwards in Spain and Italy.—Council of Poitiers, where the monk Bruno and Bohemond of Antioch preach the Crusade.—Influence of the monks of the Grande-Sauve on the chivalry of Spain.

We have seen, during Anselm's exile, the lively sympathy shown for him by Philip King of France. It is difficult to judge how far this royal sympathy may have been mingled with that jealousy which might be naturally inspired in the French monarch by the position of a prince who, being at once his rival as King of England, and the possessor of the duchy of Normandy on the Continent, was much more powerful than his suzerain. At the same time, before offering an asylum to the primate "defender and victim of the liberty of the Church," Philip had been obliged to bend beneath the maternal rod of that Church. We may remember how, carried away by his passion for the Countess of Anjou, the King of France, first excommunicated at the Council of Claremont, and then absolved on separating himself from his mistress, had again fallen back into open sin; we may remember with what energy Yves of Chartres had

denounced his fault. Pascal II., on his accession, had sent two cardinal legates, John and Benedict, to pronounce a fresh judgment on this great cause. Yves immediately wrote to congratulate one of these great prelates on having abstained from all communion with the king, thus separating himself from the other bishops who had not feared to crown him after the death of Pope Urban II., as if justice had died with him who was bound to be her defender.[1] By agreement with Yves, the legates convoked a council at Poitiers, so that it might not sit in territory directly subject to the king, where they could not without scandal hear the depositions of certain witnesses.[2] The council was opened on the octave of St. Martin in 1100, in presence of a great number of abbots and bishops.[3] After deposing the Bishop of Autun, convicted of simony, and regulating various affairs, they came to those of the king. Philip had conjured Duke William of Aquitaine, Count of Poitiers, to prevent by any means their pronouncing the sentence of excommunication against him in a town subject to the count's authority.[4] William was the more disposed to obey the prince's wishes because his own conduct was yet more scandalous, and he must have feared a similar punishment.[5]

[1] "Quidam Belgicæ provinciæ episcopi . . . tanquam mortuo præcone justitiæ, justitiam mortuam esse crediderunt."—IVON. CARNOT., Ep. 84.

[2] "Quia si intra Belgicam vel Celticam celebraretur multa premi silentio oporteret . . . quæ ventilata scandalum generarent . . . pressa vero silentio tanquam verbo Dei alligato, legationis tuæ auctoritati plurimum derogarent."—*Ibid.*

[3] There were eighty according to Hugh of Flavigny, and one hundred and forty according to Gauffridus Grossus.—*Vit. Bernardi Tironensis.*

[4] "Velocius direxerat hortans et contestans ne hoc fieri permitteret in urbe sua, quæ de ipsius regno erat."—*Append. ad Vit. B. Hilarii, Script. rer. Gallic.*, vol. xiv. p. 108. Fleury and the Benedictines call this prince William VII. as Count of Poitiers, and William IX. as Duke of Aquitaine. He was the father of William X., last Duke of Aquitaine, whose daughter Eleanor took her heritage successively to Louis VII. and to Henry II. of England. He was famed for his caustic wit and unregulated fondness for women. See WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, b. x. p. 170.

[5] "Totius pudicitiæ et sanctitatis inimicus, timens ne similem vin-

The legate John understood all the danger of the situation: every evening he might have been seen kneeling in prayer in the Church of St. Hilary, that great bishop who had so nobly withstood an Arian emperor. On the eve of the important day, John had, with tears, implored the illustrious patron of the Church of Poitiers to come to his help in the morrow's struggle. At the moment when he fell asleep in the midst of his ardent prayer, St. Hilary appeared to him and promised to aid him and make him triumph over all the enemies of the faith.[1]

Nevertheless, the next day, while the papers relating to the process were being read, the Count of Poitiers suddenly entered the council, surrounded by a band of fierce soldiers,[2] and interrupting the reading, said loudly, "The king my master has informed me that you intend to excommunicate him, to his shame and mine, in this city which I hold from him. He has therefore ordered me, by the fealty I owe him, not to suffer this, and I am come to forbid you to attempt anything of the kind."

As the count enforced these words by threatening to seize all those who should disobey him,[3] several prelates ranged themselves on his side;[4] every one was alarmed,

dictam pro criminibus actis pateretur."—GAUFF. GROSS., *Vit. Bern. Tir., loc. cit.* It must be said that all historians do not treat him so severely; Abbot Geoffrey of Vendôme openly praises him, and Mabillon doubts all the excesses imputed to him.—*Ann. Bened.*, b. lxix. No. 137.

[1] "Ibi vigiliis et orationibus sedulus instabat, donec media fere nocte ad hospitium remearet. . . . Nocte vero illa prolixius et propensius cum lacrymis orabat . . . cum in medio precum suarum obdormire cœpisset . . . Ne timeas, carissime frater . . . quoniam in concilio cras ero tecum . . ."

[2] "Nimio furore succensus, jussit omnes illos depredari, flagellari, occidi."—GAUF. GROSS., *loc. cit.* "Cum primam causam legunt . . . advenit tanquam furibundus, magna caterva stipatus suorum . . . multumque vociferans, in hæc verba prorupit. . . ."—*Scr. rer. Franc.*, vol. xiv. p. 108.

[3] "Ad dedecus ipsius et meum in hac urbe quam ab ipso habeo."—*Ibid.*

[4] FLEURY, b. lxv. No. 8.

especially the bishops and abbots of the royal domains,[1] who fled from the assembly followed by many of those present.[2] But amid all the confusion, two monks, Bernard, who had just been elected Abbot of St. Cyprian at Poitiers, and Robert d'Arbrissel, the future founder of Fontevrault, remained unmoved by the danger.[3] John, the legate, formerly a monk of Pavia,[4] more intrepid than all the rest, stopped the Fathers, crying, "If our lord the count shows himself so faithful to the orders of his temporal king, how much more should we obey the orders of the heavenly King, whose vicars we are! Let hirelings take fright and fly from the wolf, but let all good and true shepherds remain here with us and know how to endure persecution for the cause of right."[5] Then turning to the count, John said distinctly, "The blessed John the Baptist was beheaded by Herod in such circumstances as these; I am ready to suffer you to behead me also, if it pleases you." Then, holding his neck for the blow, "Strike, if you dare," he said; "I am ready to die for the truth."[6]

Duke William lived at a time when a priest's courage could be understood, and when "some light always shone from heaven;" he acknowledged himself defeated, and hastily left the church that he might not be present at the excommunication of his suzerain.[7]

The legate then once more addressed the Fathers, "Fear

[1] "Cum episcopis et abbatibus de proprietate regis."—*Scr. rer. Franc.*, *loc. cit.*

[2] "Pontifices et abbates omnes huc illucque diffugiunt."—GAUF. GROSS., *loc. cit.*

[3] "Immobiles constantesque perstiterunt."—*Ibid.*

[4] FLEURY, b. lxv. c. 10.

[5] "Si dominus comes iste sui regis, utique terreni, mandata. . . . Paveant igitur et fugiant mercenarii ad adventum lupi, maneant hic nobiscum qui sunt boni et veri pastores . . ."—*Ibid.*

[6] "Conversus ad comitem, voce clara ait: B. Joannes . . . et ego non refugio me propter hoc decollari, si volueris; et extendens collum: Percute, inquit, si audes, quia præsto sum . . ."—*Ibid.*

[7] "Ocius concilium exit, ne regem audiret excommunicari."—*Ibid.*

nothing from the threats of the prince, for his heart is in the hands of God, who will not suffer injury to be done to any of you assembled here in His name. And know also, that in this warfare, we have the support of the blessed Hilary, patron of the town. This very night he appeared to me, and told me that he would fight for us, and that we should triumph."[1]

These words restored peace and confidence; lighted tapers were brought in, to be extinguished at the moment of pronouncing the sentence of excommunication, which was passed without further opposition against both the king and Bertrade. But the duke's conduct had excited the minds of the people against the council; a crowd collected and constantly increased. In the midst of the acclamations with which such assemblies always closed, a man of the lower class, who was in one of the galleries of the church, threw a stone at the cardinal-legates, which did not reach them, but which wounded a clerk of their suite. The sight of bloodshed in the church augmented the excitement and tumult. On this the two legates, taking off their mitres, remained bareheaded, to show that they neither feared the stones which might be flung at them, nor death under any form whatever.[2] Their calmness and courage finally disarmed the rage of the multitude, and soon afterwards the duke himself came to confess his fault. Kneeling before the cardinals, he begged their pardon, and swore never again to infringe the liberty of the Church.[3] The following year, in fact, he started for the Crusade, accompanied by that Eudes, Duke of Burgundy, whom St. Anselm's glance

[1] "Habemus nobiscum in hoc conflictu præsentem et socium B. Hilarium . . . sicut ipse mihi dixit hesterna nocte."—FLEURY, b. lxv. c. 10.

[2] "Manent columnæ Christi immobiles, mortem intrepidi aperientes, et ad saxa volantia, mitris ablatis, capita nuda retegentes."—HUGO FLAVIN., *Chron. Virdun., Scr. rer. Franc.*, vol. xiii. p. 626.

[3] "Prostratus in terra coram cardinalibus, culpam confitebatur et veniam postulabat . . . se talia non commissurum cum juramento pollicitur."—*Append. ad Vit. S. Hilar., loc. cit.*

had stopped in his violent career, and recalled from his revolt against the divine laws; and who, like the Duke of Aquitaine, was urged to take the cross by the irresistible impulse of the genius of Catholicism.

As to King Philip, the terrible sentence passed on him produced its customary effect: he found that he was no longer accounted to belong to the Church. Having shortly afterwards gone with Bertrade to Sens, all the churches were closed during the fortnight of their stay. Bertrade, very much irritated, ordered the door of a chapel to be broken open, and mass was said there by a priest who was cowardly enough to obey her.[1] Philip, enraged, announced that he would go to Rome, and there obtain from the pope his absolution from the sentence of the legates, as he had already done under Urban II. But Yves of Chartres thought it his duty to warn the pope of what was passing: "Whether he comes, or whether he sends," he wrote to Pascal, "take care, both for your own sake and for ours, to hold him fast with St. Peter's chains and keys.[2] If, after absolution, he returns to his evil ways, as he has done before, let him be again imprisoned under these keys bound with these chains, and let notice of it be sent by letters, under your own hand, to all the churches. But if it should happen that God leads his heart to repentance, remember us who have borne the burden and heat of the day, and let us share in the consolation who have shared so largely in the tribulation."[3]

Philip did not execute his threat; but, about the same time, Yves was obliged to protest against a fresh scandal caused by his conduct. The church of Beauvais was vacant, and by the recommendation of the king and Bertrade,[4]

[1] FLEURY, b. lxv. c. 28.

[2] "Cavete et nobis et vobis ut semper clavibus et catenis Petri fortiter teneatur."—IVON., Ep. civ.

[3] "Si forte absolutus fuerit, et ad vomitum reversus . . . e vestigio eisdem clavibus recludatur, eisdem catenis religetur."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Voluntate regis et illius contubernalis suæ."—IVON., Ep. 87.

there had been elected as bishop a priest of high birth named Etienne de Garlande, son of the Seneschal of France, who had been formerly expelled from the Church for open adultery. Yves, full of affectionate concern for the church of Beauvais, whence he himself came, denounced this scandalous election, first to the legates John and Benedict, and then to the pope himself.[1] It was annulled at Rome, and the uncorrupted part of the chapter, with the advice of the nobles of the diocese and the consent of the people, elected a monk named Galon, of low birth, but great learning, and a disciple of Yves, and who was also a man of the most exemplary life.[2] The other canons, won by Garlande's presents, protested against the election, and denounced Galon to the king as a pupil of Yves of Chartres, and a creature of the pope. Philip and the young king Louis[3] swore that they would never acknowledge him as Bishop of Beauvais. "If such an oath," wrote Yves to the pope, "can annul a canonical election, there will in future be in France no other elections than intrusions by violence or by simony."[4] He accordingly took up warmly the cause of Galon, both with the sovereign pontiff and with the Archbishop of Rheims; and in withstanding the objections made to his *protégé's* low birth,—"If it please God," he said, "according to His custom, to choose the humble and the weak to confound the strong, who shall dare to resist Him? Was not David a shepherd before he was a king, and Peter a fisherman before he was the prince of the apostles? God constantly takes the poor from the dust and places them at the height of

[1] Ep. 87, 89, 94, 95. It seems that Yves, while opposing Etienne de Garlande's election, had the weakness to give him a letter of recommendation to the pope, of an equivocal kind indeed, but with which the pope very justly reproached him.

[2] "Consilio optimatum diœcesis suæ et laude populi."—Ep. 104. "Quemdam religiosum."—Ep. 89.

[3] By comparing the two epistles, 105 and 144 of Yves, we see that the same oath was taken by the two kings.

[4] Ep. 105.

grandeur, to show that He values neither the power nor the wisdom of this world." [1]

St. Anselm also wrote to Pascal [2] in favour of the bishop-elect of Beauvais, who, banished from his diocese by the king's obstinacy, went to Rome to seek the asylum secured to him there by the affectionate protection of the primate of England and of the most zealous bishop of France. The pope employed him profitably as his legate in Poland.[3] On his return to Rome, although absent from France, he was nominated Bishop of Paris by the unanimous voice of the clergy and people. The king made no opposition to this translation, and Galon, in return, obtained from the pope, under certain conditions, the king's absolution. Yves himself, some time after, claimed for the prince's weakness all the alleviations compatible with the good of his soul.[4] A new legate was sent, and after two councils held, one at Troyes (April 2, 1104) and the other at Beaugency (July 30), the king was finally absolved at Paris, December 2, 1104, under the conditions prescribed by the pope.

In presence of Yves, Galon, eight other bishops, and a multitude of clerks and laymen, Philip, barefooted, and with every external mark of humility and devotion, swore upon the Gospels to renounce his unlawful relations with Bertrade, and not to see her again except in the presence of unsuspected witnesses. Bertrade took the same oath. Both were then reconciled to their mother the Church by the holy bishop, Lambert of Arras, appointed by the pope to represent him.[5]

[1] "Ut ostenderet quia apud eum mundi sapientia vel secularis potentia nullius sunt momenti."—Ep. 102.

[2] Ep. iii. 69.

[3] BARON., ann. 1104, c.; PAGI, *Crit. in eumd.*

[4] "Suggerendo dicimus non ducendo . . . ut imbecillitati hominis, amodo, quantum cum salute ejus potestis, condescendatis, et terram quæ ejus anathemate periclitatur, ab hoc periculo eruatis."—Ep. 144.

[5] "Advenit rex satis devote et multum humiliter, nudis pedibus. . . . Peccatum et consuetudinem carnalis et illicitæ copulæ quam hactenus cum Bertrada exercui . . . penitus et sine retractatione abjuro. . . . In

Yves made himself remarkable in all these disputes, as well as in the general regulation of affairs of conscience, by his zeal for discipline and the good of souls. Consulted on all sides, he was considered as the light and oracle of the Church of France; his responses were distinguished at once for wisdom and justice.[1] He blamed the custom of judicial combats,[2] carried on ardently the reformation of abuses in monasteries, as well as in the rest of the Church,[3] and showed, especially in all affairs relative to the purity and freedom of marriage, a constant care for the rights of women and the maintenance of the ecclesiastical prohibitions against marriages between near relations.[4] Although he was the firmest supporter of the legitimate popes, and the most devoted of all the French bishops to the Holy See, yet we may remark in all his correspondence with the sovereign pontiffs a vigorous frankness and most complete liberty. He spared them neither advice nor remonstrances. For instance, he advised Pope Pascal to excel as much in virtue as in authority.[5] "My conscience," he wrote to him, "tells me that I am a true son of the Roman Church; when scandals arise in her I burn; her troubles are my troubles; and those who tear her with their evil tongues lacerate me."[6] He drew courage from this filial love to reprove the pope for his tolerance of narrow-mindedness in some of the

præsentia honorabilium clericorum et laicorum non parva multitudine inibi consistentium. . . . Taliter reincorporatus est rex Francorum S. catholicæ Ecclesiæ matris suæ."—Ms. Igniacens and Ms. Corbiens., ap. Labbe., *Concil.*, b. x. 668 and 742. Cf. Pagi, *Critic.*, in 1104.

[1] See the collection of his Epistles, 287 in number, newly arranged and published, with notes by Juret, canon of Langres, and Souchet, canon of Chartres, fol., Paris, 1647.

[2] Ep. 247, 252, *et passim.*

[3] Ep. 70, 110, *et passim.*

[4] Ep. 134, 166, 183, 221, 242, 243, &c.

[5] "Paschali, summo pontifici, Ivo humilis Carnotensis minister, sicut auctoritate ita præeminere virtute."—Ep. 109.

[6] "Quoniam uterinum filium Romanæ Ecclesiæ, testante conscientia mea me esse cognosco, cum scandalizatur non possum non uri, cum tribulatur, tribulor, cum detractorum livido dente laceratur, disrumpor."—Ep. 89.

legates;[1] to blame too frequent appeals to Rome;[2] to exclaim against the credulity with which calumniators of the clergy were received there, and the protection found there by rebels;[3] to criticise severely the venality of the chamberlain, and other inferior officers of the Roman court, who levied fees under all sorts of pretexts, and even taxed pens and paper.[4] "I do not know what to say to these accusations," added the prelate, "except by quoting the words of the Gospel, '*Do what they say, and not what they do.*'"[5] He let it be seen that he considered the silence of good men on these subjects of scandal a real betrayal of trust. "If," he said, "our father's shame should be again discovered, which God forbid, we shall not mock at it like the sons of perdition, but we shall cease to give useless counsels. Let your Holiness not be angry that I speak thus to you as a son to a father, for there are many lovers of righteousness who, seeing that you have pardoned or concealed too many crimes, are driven in despair to take refuge in silence."[6]

While incessantly vindicating the rigour of ecclesiastical law against prevaricators, whatever their condition, Yves desired that all proceedings should be conducted with the

[1] Ep. 109.

[2] "Super quam et impunitam appellatorum licentiam."—Ep. 219. The Cardinal Baronius replied to that reproach with justness: "Aditus iste non potest nec debet ita occludi malis, ut non pateat bonis adversus malos."—*Ann.* 1104, c. 12.

[3] "Litteras a sede apostolica nescio quibus subreptionibus impetratas nobis deferunt ad pallendam malitiam suam vel defendendam inobedientiam. . . . Ab ipsis columnis gratanter audiuntur cum vitam religiosorum aliquibus maculis respergere moliuntur."—Ep. 110.

[4] "Cubicularios et ministros sacri palatii . . . cum nec calamus nec charta gratis ibi (ut aiunt) habeatur."—Ep. 133.

[5] Matt. xxiii. 3.

[6] "Si qua pudenda patris, quod Deus avertat, revelata fuerint . . . quia multos amatores justitiæ jam vidi propter remissa flagitiis . . . ori silentium posuisse et a spe corrigendorum malorum plurimum defecisse."—Ep. 89. We do not find that the pope was ever irritated by the rude frankness of this language, and Cardinal Baronius, the ardent defender of the rights of the papacy, says while quoting this very letter: "Has litteras dedit, tanto viro dignas, et cui scriberentur valde utiles."—*Ann.* 1101, c. 10.

most strict observance of form and rule in favour of the accused. St. Gregory VII. had already struck at the abuse of extra-judicial excommunication, by repeating to the Bishop of Prague the words of St. Gregory the Great, "He who binds the innocent, soils with his hands the power to bind and to loose."[1]

When Rotrou, Count of Perche, by invading territory belonging to a knight then engaged in the Crusade,[2] and consequently under the protection of the Holy See, had drawn upon himself the sentence of excommunication which the pope commanded the Archbishop of Sens to pronounce against him, Yves, who was one of the prelate's suffragans, urged strongly that the sentence should not be promulgated until the count had been heard in his own defence. "I will not," he said, "after the fashion of assassins, strike any one without hearing him; I will not give up to Satan him who desires neither to hide himself from justice nor to contemn her."[3] He carried the same conscientiousness into his dealings with the absolution of open sinners. "If I were forced," he wrote to his metropolitan, "to admit an impenitent sinner to reconciliation, I would say to him publicly, Here is the threshold of the visible Church, I permit you to pass it at your own risk; but I cannot thus open to you the door of the heavenly kingdom."[4]

His conduct in the great contest which was carried on in his time between the ecclesiastical and secular powers was always remarkable for its moderation. Although the necessity of self-defence condemned him to be, through the

[1] See above.

[2] Hugh Vicomte de Puiset.

[3] "Nolo quemquam more sicariorum sine audientia punire." . . . —Ep. 169. Rotrou settled the question by appealing directly to the Holy See.

[4] "Si aliqua dispensatione faciente cogerer aliquem impœnitentem ad reconciliationem admittere. . . . Nolo te fallere: introitum hujus visibilis Ecclesiæ cum tuo periculo te habere permitto, sed januam regni cœlestis tali reconciliatione tibi aperire non valeo."—Ep. 171.

greater part of the pontificate of Urban II., in open warfare with a prince whose disorders he had denounced, and who had imprisoned him in consequence, yet none the less he felt an affectionate respect for that French royalty usually so devoted to the Holy See. Having himself received royal investiture, he was unwilling to declare with Gregory of holy memory [1] that this custom was as much a heresy as simony itself.[2] However, he ended by formally admitting and proclaiming the doctrine of Gregory and Urban.[3] But he would have chosen to act as mediator between the two rival powers, and to conciliate by prudence, indulgence, and all the ameliorations permissible, their reciprocal rights. "When the royal authority and that of the priesthood are in harmony," he wrote to the pope, "the world goes well and the Church is flourishing and fruitful; but when discord separates them, not only do the weak suffer, but the strong also lose their force." [4] This conciliatory spirit, however, did not at all lessen his faith in the claims, the power, and the supremacy of the Church, nor his courageous attachment to the inviolable legitimacy of her right over souls and over herself. "Let God first have in His Church by the highest right (*principaliter*) that which belongs to Him, and after that (*posteriori ordine*) let the king have

[1] "Tempore beatæ memoriæ papæ Gregorii."—Ep. 24.

[2] Ep. 236, *et passim.*

[3] "De investituris Ecclesiarum quas laici faciunt sententiam præcedentium patrum Greg. VII. et Urb. II., quantum in me est, laudo, confirmo. Quocumque autem nomine talis persuasio proprie vocetur, eorum sententiam, qui investituras laicorum defendere volunt, schismaticam judico."—Ep. 235.

[4] "Cum regnum et sacerdotium inter se conveniunt, bene regitur mundus, floret et fructificat Ecclesia: cum vero inter se discordant, non tantum parvæ res non crescunt, sed etiam magnæ res miserabiliter dilabuntur."—Ep. 238. This passage has been taken by Clement of Droste, the illustrious Bishop of Cologne, as the motto of the book, in which, while a captive and in exile for his faith, for the freedom of the Church, and the sanctity of marriage, he so wisely traced out the limits of the two powers. Thus across the ages, the souls of two great bishops met in the bosom of catholic truth to defend their common mother.

that which is granted to him by God."[1] Such was his interpretation of the text, "*Render unto Cæsar.*" He wrote to the Count of Meulan, prime minister of King Henry of England: "If the royal authority undertakes anything against Christ and His Church, you must remember that you have been bought by Christ's blood, initiated into Christ's laws, regenerated by the sacraments of the Church; that you are the freedman of Him who made Himself a servant for you, and that you owe no submission to those who would offend the divine majesty or restrain the freedom of the Church. . . . Kings are ordained to punish the violators of the law, not to violate it themselves."[2]

To the king himself, the archbishop, in congratulating him on his accession, wrote as follows: "We invite your Highness to give free course to the word of God in the kingdom which is intrusted to you, and always to remember that an earthly sovereignty is subject to the heavenly sovereignty intrusted to the Church. As our senses are subjected to our reason, and our bodies to our souls, so should a terrestrial power be subjected to the ecclesiastical power. . . . And as the body is at ease only when the flesh does not resist the spirit, so a kingdom of this world is at peace only when it ceases to resist the kingdom of God. Think of this, and understand that you are not the master, but the servant of God's servants, and that you should be like one of the cedars of Lebanon, which the Lord has planted that the birds of heaven may build their nests in them, that is to say, that Christ's poor may live in safety under your shadow, and pray for you."[3]

[1] "Habeat ergo Deus in Ecclesia sua principaliter quod suum est. Habeat rex, posteriori ordine post Deum quod sibi a Deo concessum est." —Ep. 102.

[2] "In mente habere debes quia . . . et Illius es liber qui pro te se servum fecit, ut libertas tua nihil se debere intelligat alicui quo divinam offendat majestatem, et Ecclesiæ minuat libertatem. . . . Non ad hoc instituuntur reges, ut leges frangant."—Ep. 154.

[3] "Sicut enim sensus animalis subditus debet esse rationi, ita potestas

As regarded his own person, he shrank from none of the consequences of his convictions, and he set them forth in the following words to the seigneur of his diocese, Stephen, Count of Blois and Chartres: "Whoever shall dare to injure the Church committed to my feeble care, I will resist with all the might God has given me, even to ruin and exile; and I will smite him with the spiritual sword until satisfaction is made. That sword pierces towers, throws down bulwarks and destroys all that rise up against Christ's humility or invade the heritage bought with His blood. It is a sword which poverty retempers, which exile cannot break, which no prison is able to fetter." [1]

Thus spoke to the princes of the earth that same bishop who, strong in his devotion to God and the Church, allowed himself, when there was occasion, to address remonstrances even to the popes themselves. Anselm and many others did the same; and we shall see St. Bernard surpass them all in frankness and courage. In those happy times and among those great hearts, in the midst of the most brilliant splendours, or the most terrible dangers, the papacy found a thousand champions, but not a single flatterer. The struggle of the two powers in the very heart of Christendom, seems to have been at all periods an inseparable condition of the vitality of the Catholic faith. It ceased only in those rare moments when the temporal power was placed in hands at once

terrena subdita esse debet ecclesiastico regimini. Et quantum valet corpus, nisi regatur ab anima, tantum valet terrena potestas nisi. . . . Et sicut pacatum est regnum corporis. . . . Servum servorum Dei vos esse intelligite, non dominum . . . unam debet esse de cedris Libani quas plantavit Dominus, in qua nidificent passeres," &c.—Ep. 106. A letter, says Baronius in quoting it in 1607, well worthy to be read and re-read by all kings, especially in our days when the execrable heresy of politicians, under the veil of State rights, penetrates into the cabinet of kings, and shelters itself under their glory.—*Ann.*, 1100, c. 39.

[1] "Quos terminos cuicumque præsumpserit adversus Ecclesiam parvitati meæ commissam transcendere. . . . Hic gladius penetrat turres, dejicit propugnacula, et omnem altitudinem . . . hic gladius in egestate fortior est, in exilio non frangitur, carcere non alligatur," &c.—Ep. 49.

strong and blameless, or in those too prolonged intervals when the weakness of faith and zeal among Catholics prepared and completed their enslavement. At the time of which we are speaking, this struggle had begun even in the bosom of that new kingdom founded beside the Holy Sepulchre by the victorious Crusaders, a kingdom which was a direct creation of the Roman pontificate, and, as it were, the very conquest of God and the Church. Godfrey of Bouillon had died after a reign of one year,[1] too soon for the safety of his new Christian state; and his brother, Baldwin I., elected in his place by the knights and priests, and brave and generous as Godfrey himself had been, was engaged in a long series of disputes with Daimbert,[2] the Patriarch of Jerusalem, on the subject of the old and new possessions of this enfranchised Church. The intrigues and jealousy of the Archdeacon Arnoul, an unsuccessful candidate for the dignity of which the Crusaders had thought the legate Daimbert more worthy, seem to have much contributed to keep up the unfortunate dissension.[3] Baldwin ended by expelling Daimbert from his see, and replacing him by a certain Cremar, who was in his turn deposed as an intruder by the legate Gibelinus.[4] But these discords did not lessen the ardent faith or pious devotion which inflamed the Crusaders against the constantly reinforced armies of Islam. The Mussulmans of Egypt, Syria, Arabia, and Persia, flung themselves in turn upon the new colonies of Christians, and inflicted upon them the most cruel losses, and the most sanguinary defeats, without being able to shake their constancy.

[1] July 18, 1100.

[2] Or Théobert, Archbishop of Pisa, sent as legate to the Crusading army by Urban II. in place of Adhémar, Bishop of Puy, who had died at Antioch.

[3] The details of this dispute may be seen in WILLIAM OF TYRE (b. x. c. 14; xi. c. 1 *et seq.*, xii. c. 26, ap. *Gesta Dei per Francos*), and this recital may be compared with that of Albert of Aix in the same collection. Albert is unfavourable to the patriarch.

[4] GUILL. TYR., xi. c. 4.

The capture of Jerusalem, though so dearly bought, only served to awaken the strongest enthusiasm in all Christian lands.[1] During the first year of the twelfth century there was a perpetual crusade, a permanent movement of the Western nations towards the East; and although the Holy Land had become, as it were, one vast charnel-house of vanished generations, still each year brought to its shores new armies of pilgrims eager to visit the holy places, and to fight in the ranks of that handful of heroes who, under the leadership of King Baldwin, of the Normans Tancred and Bohemond, of Count Raymond of Toulouse, and of Baldwin du Burgh, were defending their new possessions against the incessant assaults of the infidels. In 1101 a Genoese fleet aided King Baldwin to take Cæsarea by assault, and was enabled to carry off in triumph, as its principal trophy, the sacred chalice in which our Lord consecrated His blood on the night of the Last Supper.[2] But these triumphs were reserved for very few. The greater part of the Crusaders gained nothing but a glorious death, ranked by the faith of their contemporaries with that of martyrs. A hundred thousand Lombards, led by Archbishop Anselm of Milan and several nobles, started to cross Thrace and Asia Minor. The archbishop carried before them an arm of his illustrious predecessor St. Ambrose,—an arm which was constantly raised to bless the Crusaders. These pilgrims were followed and joined by an army of German knights, at whose head were Duke Welf of Bavaria, Archbishop Thiémon of Salzburg, and the Margravine Ida of Austria, whom neither her beauty nor the weakness of her sex hindered from exposing herself to the perils of an expedition in which she was to meet her death.[3] Finally, a third army set out, composed

[1] "Mox profectio populosa et quæ pene priori posset numero duntaxat æquari, subsequitur."—*Chron. Ursperg.*

[2] *Il sacro calino*, brought to Paris under the Empire, and restored to the Genoese in 1815.—Caffari ann. Genuens, ap. MURATORI, *Script. rer. Italic.*, vol. vi. p. 248.

[3] LÜDEN, *Geschichte des Deutschen*, &c., vol. ix. p. 289; ECKHARD.

of Frenchmen, among whom were William, Duke of Aquitaine, and Count of Poitou, Duke Eudes of Burgundy, the Count of Nevers,[1] and Count Harpin of Berry, who, to provide for the expenses of the expedition, had sold his county to King Philip. Public indignation forced those princes, whom the first reverses of the Crusade had driven from the army, to rejoin their companions. Among these warriors were Hugh of Vermandois, the king's brother, and Stephen of Blois, whom the reproaches of his wife Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror, and friend of Anselm, sent back to the Holy Land. These three great armies, making up more than 500,000 pilgrims,[2] perished almost to a man in the defiles of Asia, without even coming in sight of Jerusalem, sacrificed to the odious treachery of the Byzantine emperors, and the pestilential influence of the climate. The Duke of Burgundy and the Count of Blois, who succeeded in reaching Palestine, died on the battle-field of Ramla. Duke William of Aquitaine, the haughty and brilliant Count of Poitou, who had started at the head of 30,000 Poitevins in full armour, besides a crowd of infantry, returned to Aquitaine with scarcely a single follower.[3]

Still, the first enthusiasm was not extinct. After so many terrible reverses, when Bohemond, Prince of Antioch, having escaped from a Mussulman prison, where he had spent four years in captivity, came back to France,[4] he in-

abbat., *libell. in ampl. Coll.*, vol. v. p. 507; ALB. AQUEN. in *Gesta Dei per Francos.*

[1] William II., the same who was deposed with Suger from being regent of the kingdom by St. Bernard in the Second Crusade. He had himself assembled 15,000 men at Nevers, and had received before starting the benediction of St. Robert, Abbot of Molesmes, at the priory of St. Etienne at Nevers.—CROSNIER, *Tableau chronol. et synopt. du Nivernais et du Donziais.*

[2] "Præter vulgus, ad triginta millia loricatorum."—*Chron. Ursperg.*

[3] "Præter vulgus, ad triginta millia loricatis."—*Chron. Ursperg.*; *Annal. Sax.*, ad 1102, ORD. VIT. According to another version, he took 180,000 combatants.—CONC. COL., vol. xii. p. 1223.

[4] In March 1106, ORDERIC. VITAL., xi. 816. This writer attributes his

flamed all hearts by his stories of the Crusade. A true son of Robert Guiscard,[1] Bohemond had taken the part of Daimbert the patriarch, who came back to Rome with him. Pascal presented the gonfalon of St. Peter to the brave knight, and associated with him, for the purpose of preaching the Crusade, Bishop Bruno of Segni, the friend and legate of Gregory VII., who had just retired to Monte Cassino,[2] whence the pope recalled him to accompany Bohemond. The latter was on his way to France to fulfil the vow which he had made while in prison to visit as a pilgrim the tomb of the monk St. Leonard, in the church of the same name, in Limousin.[3] He there made an offering of the silver chains with which the Turks had bound him in his prison. King Philip gave to the hero his daughter Constance; and amidst the marriage festivities at Chartres, Bohemond mounted a tribune arranged in front of the altar of the Virgin, and appealing to the warriors who surrounded him, by the recital of his own adventures, and by the promises he held out to them of a great and glorious destiny, he inspired them with a keen desire to follow him to Palestine.[4] Thence the prince went to Poitiers, where the holy monk Bruno held a council in the pope's name,[5] and where both addressed the great assembly.[6] The fact of the defeats endured, and of the deplorable return of William of Aqui-

deliverance to the love which he had inspired in the daughter of the Emir, whose prisoner he was.

[1] Daimbert wrote to him: "Tu autem, nisi paternæ gloriæ vis esse degener filius, qui tyrannica crudelitate clausum ab impia manu dominum apostolicum Gregorium de urbe Roma eripuit, unde memorabile oculis omnibus nomem meruit."—GUILL. TYR., b. x. c. 14.

[2] PETR. DIACO, *Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 33.

[3] This monastic church, which gave rise to the little town of St. Leonard, is still standing; it is, as it now exists, about contemporary with Bohemond. An exact representation of it may be found in *L'Ancien Limousin*, by M. Tripon, vol. i.

[4] *Chron. Malleac.*, ann. 1106; cf. FLEURY, b. 65, No. 48

[5] June 26, 1106.

[6] "*Plenum et celebre concilium*," said the Abbé Suger, who himself assisted there.—*Vit. Lud. Crass.*, c. 9.

taine, the very prince of whose territories Poitiers was the capital, was so far from discouraging the auditors, that the knights of Limousin, Auvergne, and Poitou disputed the honour of being associated with the Norman hero, and accompanying him to Antioch.[1] The number of warriors who presented themselves was so great that Bohemond's levies are called the Third Crusade.[2]

The prince further undertook to appeal to Spain, where, three centuries before, the First Crusade—a war against the infidels—had been carried on, and where Alfonso VII. of Castile, called the Valiant, was now waging with the Almoravides a glorious contest which was to end in the taking of Cordova[3] (1108).

Bohemond brought new soldiers of the cross from Spain, and found others in Italy, with whose help he attempted to punish the Greek schismatics for their long-continued perfidy towards the Latins; but the expedition failed. It served, however, to give a wonderful testimony to the union of all Christian nations under the guidance of the popes, in that great and prolonged war against the infidels. And, finally, in the very year of Bohemond's death, a Norwegian fleet landed unexpected auxiliaries on the coast of Syria, and Sigurd, son of King Magnus, with 10,000 of his people, came to aid the King of Jerusalem to conquer Sidon (Dec. 19, 1111),[4] content to return to the shores of the Baltic with no other reward than a piece of the true cross.

Meantime Alfonso the Warrior, King of Arragon and Navarre, always supported the Crusade in Spain, and earned his surname by a great number of battles fought with the infidels, and victories gained over them. Monks were there as elsewhere more or less partakers in the movement of the

[1] MICHAUD, *Hist. des Croisades*, b. ii. p. 47, ed. 1825.

[2] "Tunc tertia profectio Occidentalium in Jerusalem facta est, multorumque maxima conglobatio millium pedibus suis Byzanteum stemma conculcare, p. 478, tantum contra Turcos progressa est."—ORD. VIT., 589.

[3] GUILL. TYR., b. xi. c. 14; TORF., *Hist. rer. Norvegicar.*, pars iii. c. 18..

[4] He reigned from 1104 to 1134. His capital was Saragossa.

Catholic nations, and maintained in their cloisters those homes of spiritual life whither kings and knights came to renew their courage and gain fresh supplies of that strength which inspired their arms and their hearts.

We have told how the monks of Cluny had been, so to speak, associated in the foundation of the kingdoms of Castile and Arragon under Sancho the Great and Ramirez I.[1] In the beginning of the eleventh century these kingdoms felt the new influence of the congregation of Notre Dame de la Grande-Sauve in Guienne, whose entirely knightly origin we have already noticed.[2] Sancho Ramirez I., who, like his grandfather Sancho the Great, united Navarre to Arragon, crossed the Pyrenees, and went to visit, in their solitude between the Gironde and the Dordogne, those heroes who had left their native country to practise Christian chivalry in the depths of unbroken forests. Amazed by the utter poverty of these servants of God,[3] the Spanish prince granted them large concessions of territory in his kingdom, and asked, in return for these gifts, that one poor man should be perpetually fed in the abbey as representing the person of the King of Arragon both present and future, with the sole obligation on the part of the monks that they should pray for their benefactor.[4] The prince also gave them beforehand all the tithes of the territory of Exea, with its mosques, to be turned into churches when he should have made himself master of it.[5] Profiting by those benefits, many houses dependent on the congregation of the Grande-Sauve were established in Spain, and there was even a special order of knights subject to this abbey who distin-

[1] See above.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] ". . . Qui de patria progressi in silva majori, dignam Deo exercebant militiam . . . cum postea ad eos gratia visendi venissem, eorumque nimiam cognovissem potestatem," &c.—Diploma of King Sancho, in *Act. SS. O. B.*, vol. ix. p. 846, ad ann. 1095.

[4] "Quatenus pro rege Sancio et pro unoquoque de successione ipsius pauper unus . . . accipiatur ut monachus, fiat omnino sine pecunia, loco regis vestiatur, manducet et bibat."

[5] CIROT., *Hist. de la Grande-Sauve*, vol. i. p. 348.

guished themselves by their exploits against the infidels.[1] Sancho was killed by an arrow in besieging Huesca;[2] but his promises were fulfilled by his son, Alfonso the Warrior. While he was besieging Exea in 1107, and the siege was greatly prolonged, the Count of Bigorne and other Gascon lords who served him as auxiliaries, reminded him of his father's engagement, and advised him to undertake before God, the Holy Virgin, and St. Gerard, the founder of the Grande-Sauve, to carry out the late king's intentions. Don Alfonso took the oath suggested; next day all the army confessed, and then having recommended themselves to St. Gerard, rushed to the assault. The town was taken, and Alfonso immediately founded there an abbey which was long celebrated in Spain. The prince then went, accompanied by all the Gascon nobility, to the monastery of the Sauve, where solemn thanksgivings were offered to the Virgin and St. Gerard.[3]

[1] CIROT., *Hist. de la Grande-Sauve*, vol. i. p. 348. [2] In 1054.

[3] V. CIROT., *Hist. de la Grande-Sauve*, vol. i. pp. 437 and 523. Cf. MARTEN., *Thesaur. Anecdot.*, i. 263, and D. DOUQUET, *Hist. de Fr.*, vol. xii. p. 384.

CHAPTER VIII

Germany, where schism was in the ascendant, did not share in the enthusiasm for Crusades.—German knights tempted to take the cross.—Robert II., Count of Flanders, performs such exploits in the Holy Land that the Saracens take him for St. George.—Eloquent words of Abbot Udalric to Pope Urban II.—The Abbey of St. Hubert in the Ardennes.—Grave accusation against Albert of Liège.—The son of Henry IV. revolts against his father.—The emperor wishes to treat with his son, who refuses.—The old emperor abandoned by his lieutenants.—Interview between Henry IV. and his son at Coblentz.—Henry V. raised to the empire.—Unexpected death of the emperor.—General Council of Guastalla.

Of all the countries of the West, Germany was the one which had least share in the crusading spirit. The Germans had regarded as folly the enthusiasm which had drawn from their homes so many knights and soldiers, so many peasants, women, and children, to fling them, in spite of the length and perils of the way, into unknown and barbarous lands.[1]

The excesses committed by the first bands of Crusaders everywhere excited a strong disgust. But the real obstacle to every great foreign expedition was to be found in the spread of the imperialist schism[2] which was dominant throughout the country. In fact, to engage in a Crusade preached by the pope would have been to accept his authority and acknowledge his orthodoxy. All who rejected this authority, therefore, found themselves excluded from the holy war; and, on the other hand, the defenders of the Roman Church

[1] "Teutonicus populus . . . tot catervas ruricolarum, fœminarum ac parvulorum quasi inaudita stultitia delirantes subsannabant, utpote qui pro certis incerta captantes. . . ."—Eckhard. Abbat., *libell.* qui dicitur Ierosolymita in *Ampl. Collect.*, vol. v. p. 507.

[2] "Orientalibus Francis, &c. . . . hæc buccina minime insonuit, propter schisma."—Eckhard.

in Germany were neither strong enough nor numerous enough to abandon their country and leave the field open to the schismatics.

The emperor, who had quitted Italy at the moment when the French Crusaders were arriving there, and the pope coming back from France, employed the three years during which the First Crusade lasted in fortifying his power in his own States. Henry, if he wanted those higher virtues which make a great man, possessed at least most of the qualities which make a skilful ruler, and he knew how to use them to repair the checks he suffered, and to restore his affairs at the very moment when they appeared most desperate. The Catholics, on the contrary, seem, towards the end of the eleventh century, to have yielded to an access of discouragement. The defection of Welf had been a severe blow to them. The most notable of the Catholic princes—Berthold of Zahringen—gave up the possession of the Duchy of Suabia to the emperor's nephew, Frederic of Hohenstaufen, in return for Henry's recognition of his ducal title, and of his rights in Brisgau and in western Switzerland. There was, as it were, a tacit suspension of hostilities, and peace was scarcely troubled by the rupture between the emperor and the archbishop, Ruthard of Mayence.[1] The latter, after having long been a partisan of the anti-pope Guibert, was offended by an unjust accusation made by the emperor, quitted his see, and took refuge in a castle of Eichsfeld, refusing all future communication with the excommunicated prince. Henry reproached him for not having watched over the property of the Jews massacred by the first Crusaders in their passage, and who belonged to him, he said, "as serfs of the imperial chamber." The emperor ordered the seizure of the archbishop's revenues, and the sale of the property of his relations.[2] At the beginning of 1099,[3] he caused his younger son Henry to

[1] He had succeeded Archbishop Wecilon in 1088.

[2] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1089.

[3] January 5, 1099.

be elected and crowned king at Aix-la-Chapelle, after having deposed and excluded from the succession his elder son Conrad, who, attached to the Church party, and married to the daughter of the Norman Count of Sicily, had been acknowledged by the Catholics as King of Italy. This young Conrad, who had always shown great external respect for his father,[1] died soon after, at Florence,[2] after two years of an exemplary reign.

The sentence of excommunication under which the impenitent emperor had so long lain, without injury to his prosperity, was gradually losing its force in the eyes of the people, and some monks even passed over to the party of the stronger.[3] Meantime the princes of both parties, who were constantly persuading the emperor to treat with the Holy See, redoubled their efforts for that end when they heard of the death of the anti-pope Guibert.[4] Henry yielded to their persuasion, and promised to go to Rome and submit to be judged by a council. But he did not keep his promise, being dissuaded by his intruded bishops,[5] who feared lest an accommodation should lose them their dioceses.

Meanwhile, the success of the First Crusade and the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre having been reported in Germany, Duke Welf of Bavaria, repenting that he had deserted the Church party, took the cross, and went, together with Thiémon, the orthodox Archbishop of Salzburg, to die in the East.[6]

[1] *Annal. Saxo.*, ad ann. 1099.

[2] July 1001. Stentzel (vol. i. p. 568) reports a quarrel between Conrad and the Countess Matilda, followed by a reconciliation before his death; but he quotes no authority for these statements, and the passage in which he gives them contains so audacious a falsification of the text of Landolphus Junior (c. 1) on the relations of Conrad with Luitprand, that it is impossible to believe this unproved assertion.

[3] "Multum pene ubique sententia excommunicationis cœpit tepescere . . quidam religiosi qui inter excommunicatos promoveri non timerent." —Bernold., ad ann. 1100.

[4] October 1100.

[5] Stentzel, i. 571.

[6] After the destruction of the German army in Asia Minor, Welf died

The desire to take part in the Crusade, and not to be left behind by all the other Catholic nations, was not long in spreading throughout the knighthood of Germany. The emperor, anxious to secure his dominion over the minds of his subjects, himself announced his intention of taking the cross, and made a public declaration to that effect at the diet of Mayence during the celebration of high mass at Christmas.[1] He also proclaimed the *Truce of God*, and a general peace for four years. He thus won all hearts.[2] But when the execution of his promise was first indefinitely postponed, and then positively refused, the indignation of the princes was roused anew. It was always the same Henry, expert in falsehood and incurable in his habits of bad faith.[3]

The zeal of the Catholic party revived. The council, before which Henry had falsely promised to appear, that his cause might be judged canonically, was held at Rome at the end of Lent 1102. Surrounded by all the Italian bishops, and in presence of envoys from most of those beyond the Alps, Pascal renewed the anathema already pronounced by his predecessors, Gregory and Urban, against the prince who had wounded and stained the Church by his rapine, perjury, and homicide.[4] The pope delivered the sentence with his own mouth, on Holy Thursday, in the Lateran Church, before an immense assembly of different nations, so

in the island of Cyprus, and Thiémon perished by the swords of the Saracens.

[1] Christmas 1102. At the same time he wrote a letter on this subject to his godfather, Abbot Hugh of Cluny, which, according to Lüden, could not have deceived anybody.

[2] "Inde favorem magnum tam vulgi quam principum et clericorum fallendo adquisivit."—*Ann. Saxo.*, 1103.

[3] "Proinde secum ficta fide versabantur et adversus eum conspirabant: en quod omnes principes regni decipiebat, &c., et nil rerum veritatis in republica fieret."

[4] "Quia, inquit, tunicam Christi scindere, id est Ecclesiam rapinis et incendiis, luxuriis, perjuriis atque homicidiis non cessavit."—*Récit d'un témoin oculaire, revenu de la croisade à Rome*, and inserted in the *Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1102.

that the news of it might be carried abroad and held for certain in distant parts of Europe. The great Countess Matilda, always steadfast in her devotion to the sacred weakness of the Church, this same year repeated, at Canossa, between the hands of Cardinal Bernard, Abbot of Vallombrosa and legate of the Holy See, the solemn donation of all her wealth, present and future, which she had already made to St. Gregory VII., desiring to enjoy it only as a feudatory of the Church.[1] A new and valuable ally of the Holy See appeared at this time in the Belgic provinces. Robert II., Count of Flanders,[2] had at first been hostile to ecclesiastical immunities; but having taken the cross in expiation for his misdeeds, he had distinguished himself among the Crusaders by his constancy and prudence. Robert performed such prodigious exploits that the Saracens took him for St. George, that patron of knighthood whom they heard perpetually invoked by the Christians. On his return from the Crusade, after the taking of Jerusalem, the Count declared himself a champion of the liberty of the Church against schismatics and usurpers. He voluntarily renounced the right of investiture; and he tried to make the law respected in the church of Cambrai, of which the intruding Bishop Gaucher had been deposed by Urban II. at the Council of Claremont, but where the imperialist schism had been long deeply rooted. With this object he allied himself to the citizens of Cambrai, who were induced to establish the independence of their municipality by expelling their bishop.[3]

The emperor, assisted, it is not clear why, by Count Hugh

[1] The text of the deed is found in MURATORI, vol. v. p. 384, from the poem of DOMNIZO and LEIBNITZ, *Scr. Brunsw.*, i. 687; and ST. MARC, *Hist. d'Italie*, vol. iv. p. 1280. At the same time Matilda made many donations to the abbeys of Vallombrosa, Polirone, &c. See MABILL., *Ann.* vol. v., *passim*.

[2] Son of Robert II. of Friesland, became Count in 1093.

[3] AUGUSTIN THIERRY, *Lettres sur l'histoire de France*, letter xiv. p. 262. This author sees in Robert's enterprise only the desire to aggrandise himself *at the expense of the imperial power*.

of Troyes, marched to the support of his creature besieged in Cambrai, and forced the Count of Flanders to retire. But he was himself obliged to retreat before the severity of winter. Pope Pascal congratulated Robert on his zeal. "Blessed be God," he said, "that since your return from the Syrian Jerusalem, you march towards the celestial Jerusalem by the deeds of a true knight, for a true knight will contend vigorously with his Lord's enemies." Then, exhorting the Count to act with the same energy against the excommunicated clergy of Liège as he had shown against those of Cambrai, but especially to combat everywhere and with all his might the chief of the heretics, the pontiff added, "You can offer to God no sacrifice more agreeable than a warfare waged with him who rises up against God, who endeavours to deprive the Church of her crown, who has set up the idol of simony in the holy place, and who has been driven from the Church by the servants of God, by the holy apostles and their vicars. This we enjoin upon you and all your knights, for the remission of your sins, and that you may be led by these labours and these triumphs to the heavenly Jerusalem."[1] About the same time Anselm of Canterbury also addressed praises and encouragement to Count Robert: "You give a good example," he said, "to other princes, and thus invite all Christians to pray for you. . . . I am the faithful lover of your soul, and I conjure you, O my friend, beloved in the Lord, never fear that you can lessen your dignity by cherishing and defending the liberty of the Church, the spouse of God, and your mother; never believe that you can humble your-

[1] "Qui reversus Hierusalem Syriæ, in cœlestem Hierusalem justis militiæ operibus ire contendis, hoc est legitimi militis. . . . Ubique cum potueris Henricum hæreticorum caput, et ejus fautores pro viribus persequaris. Nullum profecto gratius Deo sacrificium offerre poteris, quam si eum impugnes, qui . . . hoc tibi et militibus tuis in peccatorum remissionem et apostolicam familiaritatem præcipimus."—Letter of January 21, 1103. We will later notice the answer published by the Liègeois to this pontifical letter.

self by exalting her, or weaken yourself by strengthening her."[1] Robert, who received these exhortations from a pope and a primate both sprung from the monastic ranks, knew well that the Church could oppose to her enemies a force yet more to be relied upon than the sword of Catholic knights—namely, the regularity and fervour of monasteries. In them, and chiefly in the old Austrasian provinces, in Belgium and Lorraine, was kept up, as under Gregory VII., an ardent glow of resistance to schism and to lay oppression. Thence issued from time to time assurances of adhesion to the sovereign pontiff, such as that of Udalric, Abbot of St. Michel-sur-Meuse, who, amidst the general defection which in Germany marked the last years of Urban II., wrote to the pontiff: "All that you love, we love; all that you regret, we regret; all that you suffer for Christ, we suffer with you. We have few friends in this country, for fear of the tyrant has drawn to his communion those who formerly obeyed you. But we know that you have the word of life, and with you we neither shrink from hardships in this world, nor from a glorious death."[2]

Robert of Flanders saw grow up beside him the noble and illustrious Abbey of St. Bertin, reformed by the care of Abbot Lambert. The latter having found but twelve degenerate monks in his monastery, had gone to Cluny to ask for twelve others, and to make profession of submission to the holy patriarch Hugh, and on his return, had soon gathered one hundred and fifty monks under his crosier. The beneficent influence of Cluny and its abbot Hugh pro-

[1] "Precor, obsecro, moneo, ut fidelis animæ vestræ, ut nunquam æstimetis vestræ celsitudinis inimici dignitatem si sponsæ Dei et matris vestræ Ecclesiæ amatis et defenditis libertatem; nec putetis vos humiliari, &c. . . ."—S. ANSELM, Ep. iv. 13. The rest of this letter seems to show that it was written after the catastrophe of the Emperor Henry: "Videte, circumspicite, exempla sunt in promptu, considerate principes qui illam impugnant et conculcant, ad quid proficiunt, ad quid deveniunt? Satis patet: non eget dictu."

[2] "Tecum in terra laboriose vivere, vel gloriose mori non abhorremus." —BALUZ. MISCEL., vol. iv. p. 452.

duced the same happy change in St. Rémy at Rheims, in St. Médard at Soissons, in Anchin, Afflighem, and many other houses in the north of France and Flanders.[1] At Afflighem, in Brabant, the Abbot Fulgence governed two hundred and thirty monks and nuns with equal holiness and solicitude.[2] The great abbey of St. Martin at Tournay had been thoroughly restored and placed in the first rank of the most regular houses,[3] by Eudes or Odo of Orleans, who began his career as a learned and widely known professor, and was afterwards converted by reading the writings of St. Augustine. When, after having made many converts among the Flemish nobility, he determined to retire into a yet more profound solitude, all the people of Tournay opposed his project; and 60,000 men went out to meet him and celebrate his return. From him Count Robert requested disciples to reform St. Vast at Arras, and St. Peter at Ghent, and to make these abbeys once more strongholds of orthodoxy.[4] When Count Robert undertook to obey the pope by reducing the Liègeois, whose bishop, Albert, one of the warmest partisans of the excommunicated emperor, had just published a long and virulent manifesto against the rights and doctrines of the Holy See,[5]

[1] "Per Dei gratiam vix jam invenitur in Francia vel Flandria aliquod cœnobium in quo non videas Cluniacenses consuetudines servari."—HERMANN, *De inst. S. Mart. Tornac. in Spicil.*, b. xii. p. 443.

[2] MABILLON, *Ann.*, b. lxxiv. c. 59.

[3] "Cœnobium tunc in toto regno Francorum erat excellentissimæ religionis, quoniam nondum germinaverat rigor Cisterciensis, nec de domno Nortberto aliqua mentio erat."—*Ibid.*, and MABILLON, v. b. 69.

[4] Blandin, near Ghent, was only reformed in 1117 by the influence of St. Bertin.

[5] This letter, the composition of which is attributed to the monk Sigebert of Gemblours, is reproduced in the *Collection des Conciles* (ed. COLETTI, vol. xii. pp. 973-985) and analysed by Fleury (b. lxv. No. 40). The Church of Liège complains in it of the exhortations addressed by the pope to the Count of Flanders (see above) to engage him to make war on the emperor and the schismatics of Liège. The author acknowledges Pascal as the legitimate pope, and Gregory VII. also. In principle he denies to the Church the power of the sword, contests her right to excommunicate kings, approves oaths made by bishops to princes, and maintains that even heretical sovereigns ought to be obeyed. He says that Hildebrand

he could count upon the support of more than one such stronghold situated in the very diocese of Liège, and towards which schism and tyranny were bitterly hostile. In the forest of the Ardennes, which the first monks had opened up, the abbey of St. Hubert, successively governed by two abbots named Thierry, the first of whom was an intimate friend of Gregory VII., and the second a *protégé* of Urban II., had openly declared itself against Henry IV.; cruel persecution and pillage, suffered at the hands of Bishop Albert, and the violent expulsion of the second Abbot Thierry, could not shake the courage of the monks.[1] Words spoken with authority came to their support from the depths of Burgundy. Jarenton, Abbot of St. Benigne at Dijon, had been trained, like Thierry, in the school of Gregory VII., and afterwards had been commissioned by Urban II. to negotiate with William Rufus. In 1092, he had gone to Metz at the risk of his life to instal an orthodox bishop.[2] Such a man was fitted to give lessons of courage and perseverance to the monks of St. Hubert. "We wish you," he wrote to them in the name of his convent, "the spirit of Moses in the presence of Pharaoh and his servants. The trumpet of Satan sounds around us, and threatens our earthly possessions with ruin, and our mortal bodies with torments. But what signifies this to Christian love, so long as neither life nor death prevail with us to abandon the defence of truth, lose our zeal for the right, desert the bosom of our mother, and turn from the path of Rome? If you fear to be disturbed in your lowly

was the first author of a new schism, and that he first turned the sacerdotal lance against the royal diadem. He rejoices that the popes have hitherto been defeated, and says, "Lord Pascal would do well to remember how the unheard-of excesses of Hildebrand were suppressed, how false popes have been condemned and deposed, and how the imperial power has outweighed the excommunications of Hildebrand, Odo, Urban II., and Pascal. 'Ibi plus valuit virtus imperialis quam excommunicatio . . . ,'" which does not prevent him from heaping insults upon them: "*Evomuit cor domini Paschalis vile convicium prout vetula et textriees faciunt.*"

[1] *Chron. Andagin.*, ap. MARTENN., *Ampl. Coll.*, iv. 978–1019.

[2] HUGO FLAVINIAC., *Chron.*, ad ann. 1092.

existence, the house of St. Benigne is ready to receive with joy the fugitive sons of the Church."[1] But they were not to be driven to this extremity. Powerful intervention on the part of the nobles of the country forced Bishop Albert not only to restore Abbot Thierry to St. Hubert, but also the abbot to St. Laurent at Liège, his episcopal city,[2] whence he had driven him. The intruding or schismatic bishops justly feared these holy houses where zeal for justice and truth was cherished. Thence generally were drawn the true shepherds who succeeded in keeping a certain number of sees free from schism, or in displacing schismatics from their usurped episcopacy. At the Council of Rheims, in 1105, Abbot Eudes, the reformer of Tournay, was, to the despair of his monks, elected Bishop of Cambrai by the prelates of the province, thus superseding the schismatic Gaucher, who remained obstinate in his revolt against the pope.[3] At the Council of Troyes, in the preceding year,[4] the see of Amiens, also in the province of Rheims, had been confided to a monk well known for his zeal in defence of ecclesiastical celibacy. This monk, named Godfrey, and Abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy, had reformed his abbey, which had been reduced to six inhabitants, and had repeopled it with fervent monks. In the midst of his new dignity he always remained a monk both in heart and in name.[5]

[1] "Tuba Satanæ graviter intonat . . . totum libenter accipit Christi caritas, ut neque mors neque vita, terreat nos a defensione veritatis, et . . . nequeamus . . . a semita Romanæ exhorbitare sedis. . . . S. Benigni domus fugam filiorum Ecclesiæ in Christi gratia benigne suscipiet."—Cod. S. Viton., ap. MABILL., *Ann. Ben.*, b. lxx. c. 33.

[2] See the curious account in *Hist. Andaginensis in Ampliss. Collect.*, vol. iv., to which we shall return.

[3] He could not be installed till after the death of Henry IV. in 1106, Gaucher having resisted in arms the decrees of the council.—HERMANN, *De inst. S. Mart. Tornac. in Spicileg.*

[4] April 1104.

[5] *Vit. S. Godefr.*, ap. *Surium*, 8 nov.; GUIB. NOVIG., *De vita sua*, c. 22. He always called himself FRATER GODEFRIDUS, *Die gratia Ambianiensium episcopus.*—MABILL., *Ann.*, b. lxxi., No. 65. He obtained from Enguerrand, Count of Boves, the re-establishment of the abbey of St. Fuscien. Belonging

In the following year,[1] Albert of Liège was on the point of suffering the same fate as Gaucher of Cambrai. Accused, before the provincial council of Aix-la-Chapelle, by his archdeacon in the name of all his clergy,[2] of having infringed all laws both ecclesiastical and civil, of having sold abbeys, and trampled under foot the liberties guaranteed by his predecessors,[3] he was severely reprimanded, and then suspended from his office. He obtained, however, a delay to make reparation; but he profited by it only to ally himself closely with Henry, who, pursuing the course of his policy, crippled more and more the independence of the Church by substituting creatures of his own choice for prelates trained in monasteries and devoted to the Holy See.

Faithful to his system, the emperor, in 1102, expelled from the see of Osnaburg Marquard, formerly Abbot of Corbie, and a zealous Catholic.[4] In 1103 he placed an intruder in the see of Constance,[5] in the room of the holy and courageous Gebhard, that great monk of Hirschau, to whom Pascal II. had continued the office of legate, which he had filled so vigorously under Urban II. The pope was specially distressed by this last attack. Writing on February 10, 1103, to the Duke Welf of Bavaria, Berthold of

by birth to the nobility of the country, he interfered successfully in the quarrels of the Picard nobles among themselves, and especially obtained the release of Adam de St. Omer, by excommunicating the Vidame of Picquigny, who had dragged him from the bishop's *cortège* and imprisoned him.

[1] At the beginning of 1106.

[2] *Totius cleri Leodiensis*, which must be an exaggeration, for it is hard to believe that those among the clergy of Liège who held the imperialist doctrines expressed in the letter of Sigebert of Gemblours could have thus pronounced against Albert, the emperor's chief partisan.

[3] ". . . Et, quod est deterius, corrumpi consenserit . . . quod contra libertatem publici juris, leges a majoribus nostris hactenus habitas violenter infringere contenderit."—*Hist. Andaginens. Monast.*, No. 127, *in Ampliss. Collect.*, vol. iv. p. 1020.

[4] " Catholicarum partium studiosissimus."—MABILL., b. 70, c. 34.

[5] Arnoul, monk of St. Gall. We have already remarked that St. Gall was one of the few abbeys attached to the schism, and that Hirschau, on the contrary, was the centre of orthodoxy in Germany. Udalric, Abbot of St. Gall, had been made Patriarch of Aquileia by Henry.

Suabia, and other princes and nobles of this latter province, he reproached them with their cowardice and complicity with the bitter enemy of the Church. The crime was the more inexcusable in these nobles, because they had formerly been the defenders and devoted sons of their outraged mother. The holy Father ended his letter by exhorting the culprits to return to the right way, and follow the instructions of Gebhard, whom he called the eye of the Church. If they should so act, he promised them absolution from all the censures which they might have deserved, and which he intended to pronounce once more against the intruder, who, like a decayed limb, had just been cut off from Catholic unity.[1]

The same day the pope addressed to the monks of Hirschau, and all Catholic abbots and monks of Suabia, a command to take Gebhard for their model, to surround him with their love, and to seek from him the help they needed in the midst of their tribulations.[2] "But," he added, "these tribulations are your glory. The world rages more than ever against you, persecutions increase, the waves of the ocean rise and seem ready to engulf you. But our Lord had trodden these waves. Let us learn to imitate our fathers, let us learn how to rejoice in the midst of suffering. Your sorrow shall soon be turned into joy. Soon, by the merits of the holy apostles, an end shall be put to your persecutions through Him who said, '*I have overcome the world.*'"[3] This prediction of the pontiff was shortly to be

[1] "Perverso capiti adhæsistis, membra ejusdem Ecclesiæ quæ vos in Christo generavit, injurias irrogantes, et cum malorum omnium capite ipsam matrem vestram infestationibus aggravantes . . . qui ejus vos defensores, ejus vos novimus amatores . . . habetis juxta vos summi capitis membrum et Ecclesiæ oculum . . . Porro . . . excommunicatum et a catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitate tanquam putridum membrum esse præcisum. Hunc quasi mortiferum venenum per omnia fugat."—NEUGART, *Codex diplomaticus Alemanniæ*, S. Blasii, 1798, b. ii. p. 833.

[2] "Dilectis G. Hirsaugiensi et cæteris catholicis abbatibus per Sueviam."—*Ibid.*, No. 832.

[3] "Audivimus, carissimi, quia plus solito . . . in vos fluctus maris

accomplished—the end of the labyrinth traversed by the *personal enemy* of the Church was almost reached; his own bishops, those of them, at least, whose lives were befitting their high position, deserted him. Bruner, even, a Franconian noble full of talent and courage, whom he had made Archbishop of Treves, and himself invested with crosier and ring, desired, at the end of three years, to obtain the pope's confirmation of his dignity, and went to Rome, where the sovereign pontiff in his annual council [1] severely reprimanded him for having received lay investiture. The prelate was obliged to lay down his office, which the pope, in consideration of the services he would be able to render to the Church,[2] restored to him three days later, at the request of the bishops, and after imposing on him a public penance.

There was at the imperial court a Suabian gentleman, not rich, but pious and learned, named Otho, whom Henry had made his chaplain, and on whom he bestowed in 1102, in spite of his reluctance, the bishopric of Bamberg. Otho feared the responsibility of lay investiture, and was no sooner installed at Bamberg, which he entered walking barefoot over snow and ice,[3] than he hurried to Rome, and there, laying his crosier and ring at the pope's feet, explained the affair, begged pardon for his imprudence or error, and promised to submit to canonical punishment.[4] The pope not only forgave him, but consecrated him himself;[5] and then sent him back to his diocese, a devoted servant of the Holy See.[6] These ecclesiastical defections were but the forerunners

acrius surgant; sed admirabilis in excelsis Dominus, qui suis ea pedibus calcat . . . in tribulationibus vestris quæ est gloria vestra. . . . Tristitia enim nostra vertatur in gaudium," &c.—NEUGART, *loc. cit.*

[1] PAGI, ad ann. 1104, c. 11.

[2] *Chron. hist. Trevir. in Spicileg.*, 2, 12, and *Conc. Coletti*, b. xii. p. 1113.

[3] *Vit. S. Otton. in Canis. Thes. antiq. lection.*, c. 5, by an eyewitness.

[4] "Fatetur omnia, baculum ponit et annulum ad pedes Apostolici . . . pro quo et severius in se canonicæ, districtionis sibimet imprecatur ultionem."—*Ibid.*

[5] At Pentecost 1103.

[6] Baronius calls him "transfugam a schismaticis ad catholicos."—*Ann.*, 1103, c. 1, cf. Ep. OTTON and PASCH., papæ *ad Eccles. Babenberg.*, *ibid.*

of the storm which was about to break upon the emperor. The lay princes were gradually separating themselves from him. They imputed to him the murder of two of the most considerable among them, Conrad of Beichlingen, and Sieghart of Bavaria.[1] They wanted only a chief to lead them, and this chief was found in the emperor's own son, the young King Henry, for whose benefit he had disinherited his elder son Conrad. The prince's companions in his pleasures excited him to rise up against the emperor, whom the Church, they said, had rejected, and whom all the nobles agreed to detest.[2] Henry was easily led away by these counsels; it is not certain whether he even needed them. He was twenty-four years of age, and already his prudence and his extraordinary qualities had won him many adherents. His position gave hopes to those who sincerely desired the reconciliation of the Church with the empire, and saw the impossibility of arriving at that result while the old emperor was in power.[3] He, indeed, during a reign of fifty years, had always trampled under foot not only the rights of the Church, but also the traditional liberties which constituted the common law of the empire. The young king, on the contrary, seemed animated by the most lively desire to restore every one to his rights, and by humble devotion to the Church. We may believe that his mind had been revolted by his father's determination to strengthen himself in schism, and to brave excommunication;[4] but political interests also weighed with the young prince. Already recognised as king and successor to his father by the whole

[1] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1103 and 1104.

[2] "Maxime cum patrem ejus excommunicatum et Ecclesia dudum rejecerit et proceres regni reprobaverint."—*Vita Henrici*, p. 387, ap. URSTIS., *Script. rer. German.*

[3] Contemporary chronicles often call him Henricus senior, not so much on account of his age, for he was not much more than fifty, but to distinguish him from his son.

[4] "Detestabatur eum filius, sicuti cuncti fideles, quia denuntiabatur excommunicatus ab apostolicis Gregorio, Urbano, Paschali."—*Ann. Sax.*, ad ann. 1104.

imperialist party, it was of consequence to him not to suffer the Catholic party again to elect such a chief as Rodolph of Suabia or Hermann of Luxemburg; it was important to him to obtain his succession to the empire by the unanimous will of the princes, the bishops, and the pope himself.[1] The rupture between father and son took place at Fritzlau, in December 1104. The young king suddenly left the army which Henry was leading against an insurgent vassal, and declaring that he would not hold further intercourse with the emperor while he continued excommunicated, immediately sent word to the pope that he was ready to make his submission, and asked his advice as to the oath he had taken never to claim the government without his father's permission. Pascal charged the legate Gebhard to receive the prince into the bosom of the Church, and to give him the apostolic benediction, promising him absolution at the last judgment if he would engage to be a just king, and to repair the crimes of his father Henry IV. towards the Church.[2]

[1] This is what has been perfectly shown by Gervais: *Politische Geschichte Deutschlands unter Heinrich V. und Lothar III.*: Leipzig, 1841.

[2] "Apostolicus, ut audivit inter patrem et filium dissidium, *sperans hoc a Deo evenisse*, mandavit ei . . . de hoc commisso sibi promittens absolutionem in judicio futuro, si vellet *justus rex et gubernator esse Ecclesiæ*, quæ per negligentiam patris sui deturbata est multo tempore."—*Ann. Saxo.*, ad 1105. Fleury says (b. lxv. No. 37): "The emperor's excommunication was the pretext for his son Henry's revolt, and the young prince was *artfully incited* to it by the letters of Pope Pascal, who exhorted him to assist in delivering the Church of God. Thus speaks a monk and a contemporary writer, who adds that the son, ambitious, and delighted to see himself authorised, armed himself eagerly against his father." Here the calumnious malice of the Gallican priest contemporary with Louis XIV. surpasses that of the imperialist chroniclers of Henry's time, and even that of Protestant and rationalist historians of our own days. The *Vita Henrici* (p. 387), the source most favourable to Henry, says expressly that the young king was urged to revolt against his father by the young men of his court: "*Frequenter cum venatum secum abducebant, conviciorum illecebris inescabant, jocis in dissolutionem animi mulcebant . . . denique ut fit inter adolescentes*," &c. Stentzel and Lüden, Henry's modern apologists, say the same; the latter says only that Pascal was no doubt informed of the young Henry's plans, but without quoting the least proof of the assertion. Fleury, instead of following competent authorities, has preferred, in accusing of artifice the

The emperor much wished to enter into negotiations with his son; but the prince refused any intercourse with his father until the excommunication should be taken off. All Bavaria pronounced for the young prince; the towns and the nobles of Saxony, too justly angry with the elder Henry, unanimously recognised his successor. The latter, in concert with the legate Gebhard and Archbishop Ruthard of Mayence, occupied himself in bringing back the churches of Saxony and other parts of Germany into the Roman unity.[1] He restored to their abbeys the monks who had been exiled for defending the cause of the Church;[2] and he obliged the imperialist bishops either to abandon the schism, or else to give place to the legitimate holders of their sees, or to men newly elected and imbued with the Roman spirit.[3]

Henry V. displayed his piety by walking barefoot in the procession on Holy Thursday at Quedlenburg, and completely won the hearts of his subjects by his humility at the provincial council of Nordhausen,[4] where the decrees of the orthodox assemblies were renewed, and where an immense crowd of bishops, abbots, and monks, all eager for the establishment of unity, were gathered together.[5] The young king would not enter until the fathers of the council called him; he then appeared in the most simple

one among all the popes who showed himself least capable of it, to follow the account of Hermann of Tournay, a writer not personally acquainted with the events, of which indeed he only speaks in passing, in his narrative of the re-establishment of the Abbey of St. Martin, *in Spicil.*, vol. xii. No. 83. Stentzel himself acknowledges the inexactness of Hermann, vol. i. p. 600, note 44. There is nothing more evident in this affair than the total absence of initiative on the part of the pope.

[1] "Totam Saxoniam apostolicæ sedi reconciliavit."—*Ann. Saxo.*, ad 1105.

[2] Especially at Isenburg, where the martyr-bishop Burkhardt of Halberstadt had died.

[3] Thus at Halberstadt, Minden, Paderborn, Hildesheim, Magdeburg, Würzburg, Ratisbon, and Spire. This last see was given to Gebhard, Abbot of Hirschau, the abbey so often mentioned as the chief centre of Catholic resistance.

[4] May 29, 1005.

[5] "Ingens enim cum episcopis et clericis, abbatum et monachorum Ecclesiæ unitatem sitiens turba confluxerat."—*Chron. Urspcrg.*, ad 1105, &c.

costume, confirmed all the decrees of his predecessors, and spoke with such pathos and piety of his zeal for the salvation of his father and of his resolution to obey him like the lowest serf if he would only submit to the vicar of Peter, that all the assembly, weeping, burst out into loud acclamations, and afterwards chanted litanies for the conversion of the father and the prosperity of the son.[1]

When the emperor had marched against his son, and the two armies were face to face on the banks of the Regen, the prince renewed his protestations, declaring that he had no wish to be guilty of parricide, and that his purpose was to be not an aggressor but a defender.[2] And when the emperor prepared for the fight, those princes who were under his banners refused to give battle and drew back. Henry first fled to Bohemia, and then to the Rhine, where the citizens were generally favourable to him.[3] His son followed closely, re-established the primate Ruthard in the see of Mayence, and convoked a solemn diet at that place for Christmas. In this extremity, the emperor remembered that at Rome there was a pope whom he had never acknowledged, and against whom he had supported three consecutive anti-popes; by the advice of his partisans he wrote a letter to Pascal, in which, recognising him as pope, he begged him to act paternally towards him, and send a nuncio who might serve as mediator between him and his

[1] "Abjecto productus habitu . . . serviliter spondebat subesse: quæ verba omnis multitudo collaudans . . . lacrymas et preces effudit, voce magna *Kyrie eleison* declamans."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad 1105, &c.

[2] "Ego parricida vocari vel esse nolo . . . me non impugnatorem patris, sed paterni regni propugnatorem esse noveritis."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, and *Ann. Saxon.*, ad ann. 1105.

[3] He went from Mayence to Hammerstein, a fortress, the ruins of which may be still seen on the Rhine between Andernach and Bonn; then to Cologne, where the Archbishop Frederic was hostile but the citizens friendly to him. Those of Mayence, to the number of 20,000, took up arms in his cause (*Udalr. Cod.*, Ep. No. 213, in ECKHARD., vol. ii.), which did not prevent their opening their gates to the young king and receiving the primate Ruthard with enthusiasm.—*Ann. Saxon.*, ad ann. 1005.

son.[1] But before this letter could reach Rome all was over. The two princes having met at Coblentz,[2] the old emperor threw himself at his son's feet, and conjured him to remember that, even if God willed his chastisement, it was not the part of a son to punish his father's faults.[3] The young king knelt in his turn and swore to obey as a knight his lord and as a son his father, if the emperor would consent to be reconciled to the Holy See.[4] Henry having declared that he did consent, both marched on together to the approaching Council of Mayence where the diet was held. All the princes of Germany, except the Duke of Saxony, had arrived in the city, and a new legate from the pope, Richard, Cardinal-Bishop of Albano, had come thither to join Gebhard of Constance in publishing once more the sentence of excommunication against the emperor. The two prelates received a solemn abjuration of the schism pronounced by all present.

In this state of affairs, Henry IV., who was singularly terrified by his imprisonment, demanded to appear before the diet; but the princes, fearing a popular commotion in Mayence in his favour,[5] decided that the meeting should be held at Ingelheim, once the residence of Charlemagne, the glorious founder of the Holy Roman Empire. Thither was brought, a captive and desolate, the great emperor's successor. They summoned him to abdicate, not without threats of putting him to death. He consented; asking only that his life might be spared, saying that he no longer

[1] See the text of the letter in URSTIS., *Script. rer. Germ.*, p. 395, BARON., *Ann.*, ad ann. 1105, c. 6. He there complains of the severity of Pascal's predecessors since Nicholas II. and Alexander II., of whose charity he boasts.

[2] December 21, 1105.

[3] "Si pro peccatis meis flagellandus eram a Deo, culpæ patris vindicem filium, et nulla divinæ legis constituit sanctio."

[4] "Ut miles domino, ut patri filius cum fide et veritate obauditurum cum lacrymis promisit si modo vellem. . . ."—Ep. *Henr. ad reg. Franc.*, ap. URSTIS., 396, BARONIUS, *loc. cit.*

[5] *Ann. Saxo.*, 1106.

felt able to hold the reins of government, and that it was time he should think of his soul. He even went farther; throwing himself at his son's feet, he implored the prince to spare him new affronts. At this spectacle the whole assembly was profoundly touched. Many wept; the young Henry alone remained insensible;[1] Cardinal Richard then interfered, and told the prisoner that his sole chance of safety lay in confessing that he had unjustly persecuted Pope Gregory, the Holy See, and the whole Church.[2] Henry begged some delay in order to justify himself, but it was refused. Then, kneeling before the legate, he implored him at least to obtain for him the favour of immediate absolution when he should have confessed.[3] The princes, moved by pity,[4] thought this prayer should be granted; but the legate replied that he had no power to absolve so great a criminal in the absence of the pope.[5] The unfortunate emperor being able to obtain nothing consented to all; he abdicated the imperial crown, confessed

[1] "Non via coactum, sed propria voluntate inductum . . . sibi jam deficere vires ad moderandas regni habenas. . . . Tempus esse ut honore cum onere deposito, provideret animæ suæ." . . . "Multos ad gemitus et lacrymas commovit. . . . Cum caderet ad pedes filii, orans, &c. . . . nec vultum nec animum ad patrem reflexit."—*Hist. de Vita Henrici IV.*, ap. URSTIS. . . . *German. Histor.*, p. 389.

[2] It would seem that there were two successive discussions,—one with the princes as to the abdication, and the other with the cardinal as to the retractation and absolution. The emperor, whose version, given in his letter to the King of France, we follow, says: "Legatus qui ibidem aderat (non dico quia omnia hæc audierat) respondit." The annals of Hildesheim, &c., say: "Cardinalis qui inopinate ad hæc facta convenerat." Thus it results that he took no part in the threats relative to the abdication, which, however, does not justify his great severity towards the captive.

[3] *Vita Henrici*, ap. URSTISIUM, *loc. cit.*

[4] "Laici misericordia moti veniam dabant."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann 1106.

[5] "Se nullo modo tam magnam personam, propter quem tanta mala in regno sint perpetrata, absente Apostolico nullo modo suscipere."—*Ann. Saxon.* "Dixit non esse sui juris me absolvere; si vellem, inquit, absolvi, Romam irem satisfacere Apostolicæ sedi."—Ep., *Henr. ad regem Franc.*

his guilt, and remained solitary, despoiled, hopeless, and still excommunicated.[1] The expiation, hard as it might be, had been merited by thirty years of crimes against the Church, against the domestic virtues, justice, and honour; but it is for ever to be regretted that it was inflicted by a son with apparent sanction on the part of the Church.[2]

The princes then elected the young Henry king, excluding his father's intervention, and the Archbishop of Mayence delivered to him the crown, sceptre, cross, lance, and sword which the emperor had given up, saying to him, "If you fail to govern the kingdom justly, and to defend

[1] "Sic desolatum et spoliatum . . . in eadem villa reliquerunt me." —Ep., *Henr. ad regem Franc.*

[2] We are far from desiring to associate ourselves with the systematic falsification of Gallican, Protestant, and rationalist historians, who have all chosen to represent Henry IV. as an innocent victim, a venerable old man, shamefully persecuted by a parricidal son and a fanatical clergy, and who are careful not to remember the atrocious crimes which he had committed throughout his reign against the popes, against the honour of women and his own, against all the political and social rights of Germany. For us, Henry IV. is an odious tyrant who merited a thousand times to be deposed by the double authority of the Church and the German nobles. But after an attentive study of two different versions of this great event, we find that the young king (very unlike his elder brother Conrad) acted with a revolting faithlessness worthy of his father; we think also that the legate Richard did not, in the moment of victory, show that compassion which is a special and exclusive right of the Church. It is painful to us to dissent here from the opinion of Baronius, who, after having reproduced with an impartiality never imitated by the enemies of the Church all the emperor's imprecations against his son, concludes thus: "Inter quos si arbiter sedeas quod ad persecutionem, captivitatem, atque privationem imperii spectat per filium procuratas in patrem, cum ex animi affectu ista pendeant, nihil habes in quo damnes filium magis quam si vehementi febre phrenetico, deliranti, insanienti, furentique pius filius injiciat vincula patri, si vero intuitu pietatis, ut facere præ se tulit, ea omnia præstitit. Certe quidem furor Henrici senioris toto vitæ suæ tempore majoribus in dies accessionibus auctus in Ecclesiæ catholicæ detrimentum, et cladem assiduam occidentalis imperii, ejusmodi plurimis experimentis cognitus est, ut aliter curari non posset, nisi hujus modi vinculis. . . . Cæterum (quod exclamat pater) si ea ex malis artibus nempe perjuriis offensæ præstitæ fidei, fieri contigerunt, laudari minime possunt."—*Ann.*, 1106, c. 14.

the Church of God, may you suffer the fate of your predecessor!"[1]

In spite of the greatness of his fall, Henry IV. had for a moment a hope of rising again. Having recovered a little from the condemnation which had struck him down, and fearing lest he might be imprisoned for the rest of his life, he took refuge, first at Cologne, which was devoted to him, and afterwards at Liège, where there was an excommunicated clergy openly hostile to the Church, and a bishop, Albert, who immediately took up arms to defend the fallen sovereign. This was not all; first, other Rhine cities, excited by the Bishop of Liège, and afterwards the Duke of Lorraine and several other princes, declared themselves in turn for the old monarch. Henry hastened to address to the kings of France, England, Denmark, and other countries a detailed account of the treatment to which he had been subjected, calling upon them to observe that the common interests of all the kings of Christendom were concerned.[2] He wrote at the same time to his godfather, the holy Abbot Hugh of Cluny, whom he implored to intercede with the pope in his favour, giving him full power to treat in his name.[3] He promised to devote himself for the future exclusively to the restoration of the Church, and to go to the Crusade as soon as peace should be concluded.

The partisans of the astute prince regained courage. The citizens of Trent, with a certain Count Adalbert, stopped in the defiles of the Tyrol the bishops and princes whom the diet of Mayence were sending as ambassadors to

[1] "Ut si non justus, regni gubernator et Ecclesiarum Dei defensator existeret, ut ei sicut patri suo eveniret."—*Ann. Saxon.*, ad ann. 1106.

[2] "Vestra tamen et omnium regum terræ interesset, injuriam et contemptum meum vindicare."—Ep. *ad reg. Franc.*, ap. *Chron. Ursperg.* and *Cod. Udalr.*, Ep., No. 226, in *Ecc. corp. hist.*, b. ii.; BARON., 1106; cf. *Resp. princip., ibid.*

[3] "Ita ut salvo honore nostro totum papæ faciam quod disposueritis. . . . Pro reparatione Ecclesiarum quæ nostris temporibus nostris peccatis, heu! corruerunt, omnibus modis prout Deus vires dederit, volumus laborare."—*In Spicilegio*, iii. 443.

beg the pope to come to Germany; all these personages were robbed and imprisoned.[1] The young king having marched against Liège, saw his advanced-guard put to rout by the Lorrainers of the imperial party at Vesel on the Meuse: he vainly besieged Cologne, whence the citizens had driven the orthodox archbishop, and which they held for Henry IV. The latter soon found himself at the head of an army with which he could surround that of the besiegers. Resuming the imperial title, which he had abandoned at Ingelheim, he published two manifestoes, addressed one to the princes and bishops, and the other to his son, whom he reproached for his unfaithfulness to his word, and for the violence of which he had been guilty towards his father. In this document he added that he was ready to submit his cause to the judgment of a council composed of princes and monks, among whom should be Hugh of Cluny;[2] that he demanded a suspension of hostilities, and appealed to the pope and the holy Roman Church.[3] The young king caused the answer of the princes to be read to his army by the Archbishop of Magdeburg. It commenced thus: "After forty years of discord, sacrilege, perjury, and crime, which have reduced our kingdom almost to apostasy and paganism,[4] we, being the sons of the spouse of Christ, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, have returned to the unity of the faith, and rejected the incorrigible chief of the schism, Henry IV., who calls himself our emperor, and we have done this out of zeal for God, and obedience to the

[1] Except only Gebhard, Bishop of Constance, who succeeded in finding circuitous paths, and so was able to rejoin the Countess Matilda and Otho of Bamberg, whose vassal Adalbert was.

[2] "Pro concilio vestro et aliorum qui nos odio hon habent religiosorum virorum . . . spiritualis patris nostri H. Cluniacensis abbatis."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1106; BARON., eod. ann.

[3] "Appellamus Romanum pontificem, et sanctam universalem Romanam sedem et Ecclesiam."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Regnum nostrum non tantum in solitudinem, sed etiam ad apostasiam catholicæ fidei, sive in ipsum paganismum propemodum redegit."—*Ibid.*

apostolic faith, and have chosen a Catholic king sprung from the same blood.[1] But now, after having voluntarily abdicated, the fallen emperor pretends that he has suffered violence, and complains of this injury to all the kings of the earth, whom he endeavours to excite against us. His only object is to dissolve the army of Christ, again to ravage the Lord's vineyard, and once more to crucify the scarcely risen Saviour.[2] Therefore, to take from him all pretext for complaint, we, the king, in concert with the princes of the kingdom, and the orthodox army, grant to Henry permission to come to this place with whatever guarantee he may desire, to plead his cause before the assembled senate and people, to do and to receive justice for all that has passed since the commencement of the schism, that right may be done to the father and the son alike, and that we may make an end immediately, and not after the delay asked for, of all the disputes which agitate the Church and the kingdom."[3]

But the old emperor,[4] with the consciousness of power, had regained his habitual cunning; the commissioners who brought him the message were so maltreated as to be in peril of their lives, and were sent back with no other answer than a summons to their senders to lay down their arms immediately, and appoint a final conference to treat for peace.

During this time the imperial forces daily increased. The young king was obliged to raise the siege of Cologne, and proposed to his father either to fight immediately or to hold a conference in eight days. Henry replied by a new mani-

[1] "Henricum . . . zelo Dei et Apostolicæ fidei obedientia abdicavimus, catholicum nobis, licet ipsius de semine elegimus."—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.*

[2] "Re autem vera solitis argumentis castra hæc Domini dispergere, Christi exercitum exarmare conatur . . . immo Christum jam iterum in Ecclesia sua resurgentum in omnium cordibus crucifigere meditatur."

[3] "Coram præsenti senatu simul ac populo causam suam agat, justitiam suscipiat, justitiam et reddat quatenus . . . tam filio quam patri justitia sua respondeat."

[4] "Quam legationem . . . susceptam ex imperatori sæpedicto . . . cum retulissent."—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.*

festo, in which he declared that the interval was too short; that he required the presence of the most distant princes, such as the Duke of Bohemia, the Count of Burgundy, and others; that he again appealed to the Holy See, and in default of being heard there, confided his cause to the Holy Trinity, the Blessed Virgin, St. Peter, and St. Lambert, patron of Liège, where he then was.[1] A battle, therefore, seemed inevitable, when Erkenbold, Henry's faithful chamberlain, and Burkhard, Bishop of Munster, whom he had kept prisoner, brought to the young king the sword and diadem of his father,[2] carried off by a sudden death at Liège, August 7, 1106. He was not fifty-five years of age, and had reigned fifty. His body, first interred in the Cathedral of St. Lambert by Bishop Albert, was exhumed by the advice of the princes, until the absolution of the defunct should be obtained from Rome.[3] It was laid on an island in the Meuse, under the care of a single monk returned from Jerusalem, who chanted psalms day and night for the repose of the dead emperor's soul. Afterwards the body was carried to Spires, where the sovereigns of his house had their burial-place; but the monk of Hirschau who had become Bishop of Spires, refused to admit it into the cathedral, to the great discontent of the citizens of the town, which Henry had specially loved and embellished.

The prince having died excommunicated, could not receive the honours due to a Catholic emperor; his body therefore remained in a stone sarcophagus[4] under the porch, because,

[1] This third letter is found with the others in Urstisius (*Scr. Germ. rer.*, p. 399) and in Baronius.

[2] *Ann. Saxo.; Annal. Hildesheim*, ad ann. 1106, ap. LEIBNITZ., *Script. rer. Brunsw.*, vol. i.

[3] "Quia quibus vivis Ecclesia non communicat, illis etiam nec mortuis communicare possit."—*Ann. Saxon., loc. cit.*

[4] "In sarcophago lapideo."—*Chron. Ursperg.* This refusal of sepulture has been the occasion of great outcries from all Protestant and philosophical writers. It was nevertheless obligatory, unless the Church would allow that the excommunication was a ridiculous formality, and that all men are not equal before God.

even in death, he did not belong to the great Christian community.

Thus, at the age of fifty-five, and after a reign of half a century, died the most formidable enemy perhaps that the Church had ever met since she issued from the catacombs. He was the more formidable because, instead of being, like her ancient persecutors, a stranger to the Church, he occupied the foremost rank among her children, and also because no one could deny the numerous good qualities which in him were mingled with the most perverse and most lamentable dispositions. His adversaries did not hesitate to acknowledge that no one could have been better fitted for empire than he, if his soul had not been depraved, and, as it were, suffocated by his passions.[1]

The joy of the Catholic party was very great. Divine justice had at length spoken; the Church was avenged of the Pharaoh, of the Nebuchadnezzar who had oppressed her for half a century: a second time the Galilean had conquered.[2] The holiest and least vindictive souls sought

[1] "Nemo videretur fascibus imperialibus ipso aptior, si tamen in conflictu vitiorum homo non degeneraret vel succumberet interior."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1106. This judgment of a twelfth century monk agrees exactly with that pronounced a hundred and fifty years later by the Franciscan Salimbeni on Frederic II., the most brilliant imitator of Henry IV.: "an accomplished man, if he had but loved his soul!"

[2] "Universorum tam ibidem quam ubivis fere christianorum corda simul et ora infinito nimis tripudio . . . rumore replesse. Non altius concinebat Israel Domino, Pharaone demerso. . . . Deo autem gratias qui, licet tarde, tamen permagnifice victoriam concessit Ecclesiæ suæ, cui etiam ejusdem Nabuchodonosor quinquagesimum exactionis annum iste Galileus, qui Julianum quondam vicerat, vertit in Jubilæum."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1106. It is well known that the important chronicle which bears the name of Urspergense (Auersperg) was not entirely drawn up by Abbot Conrad of Lichtenau, whose name it bears and who finished it in 1126. The first part, and notably all the reigns of Henry IV. and Henry V., is the work of a contemporary of these princes who constantly speaks as an ocular witness, and who is thought to have been a monk of Bamberg. See PAGI in *Crit. Baron.*, ad ann. 1102 and 1105; STENTZEL, vol. ii. p. 106. The latter owns that this chronicle forms the most authentic source before the reign of Henry V. It has been almost literally transcribed by the annalist Saxo.

to draw lessons useful to their neighbour from this great example: "See," wrote St. Anselm to the Count of Flanders, "look round you and consider the fate of princes who attack the Church and trample her under foot."[1]

The abbot Hugh of Cluny, so often invoked by the dead emperor during his last days, took occasion from this death to exhort King Philip of France to end his life in the monastic habit at Cluny.[2]

Henry V., by his father's death, found himself uncontested possessor of the German royalty; the sanction of the Church alone was yet wanting to him.

Pascal II., who had advanced towards the Alps, held a general council at Guastalla on the banks of the Po, on October 22, 1107, with the assistance of the indefatigable Countess Matilda. There he received the ambassadors of the young Henry, who came to ask his confirmation of their prince's election, to promise him that the successor of Henry IV. would be the faithful servant of the Holy See, and that he would submit to the Church as to his mother and to the pope as to his father.[3] Pascal gave a series of decrees needful for consolidating the Church's victory;[4] he

[1] "Videte, circumspicite . . . satis patet, non eget dictu."—S. ANSELM., Ep. iv. 13.

[2] *In Spicileg.*, vol. ii. ep. 18, p. 400.

[3] "Quærens ut jus sibi regni
Concedat, sedi sanctæ cupit ipse fidelis
Esse velut matri, subjici sibi vel quasi patri."
—DOMNIZO, *Vita Math.*, ii. 17.

Stentzel translates *jus regni* by "the right of giving investiture to bishops"—a version which appears in direct contradiction with all the antecedents of the position and with the decree immediately afterwards pronounced by the pope. What proves this to be a misreading is that the *Life of Matilda*, in prose, by an anonymous writer, published in Muratori (*Script.*, vol. v. p. 396), says expressly, "Petens ut sibi *regnandi jus* concederet." Stentzel, indeed, rightly remarks the kind of derision which the young king's promise contained since his mother was dead and he had betrayed and deposed his father. Take in this light, his promise was kept.

[4] Ravenna, see of the anti-pope Guibert, was deprived of its rights as metropolitan over the towns of the Emilian provinces.

consecrated and reconciled several prelates, deposed others; appointed as Bishop of Parma, at the request of the Parmesans, Cardinal Bernard Uberti, Abbot of Vallombrosa, who, two years before, had been dragged from the cathedral, wounded, beaten, and thrown into prison by these same Parmesans, then entirely devoted to the emperor.[1] Out of love for peace, and regard to the small number of German bishops who had remained orthodox,[2] the pope recognised the bishops ordained during the schism, except the intruders and the simoniacs; but at the same time, to signalise, as said the canon of the council, the Church's return to her natural freedom,[3] he formally confirmed the absolute prohibition of lay investiture. The Germans expected that he would then cross the Alps in reply to their pressing invitations, and celebrate Christmas with the king and princes at Mayence;[4] but an insurrection at Verona,[5] and other

[1] DOMNIZO, *Vita Math.*, ii. 14, 17.

[2] "Ut vix pauci sacerdotes aut clerici catholici in tanta terrarum latitudine reperiantur. Tot igitur filiis in hac strage jacentibus, Christianæ pacis necessitas exigit, ut super nos materna Ecclesiæ viscera aperiantur."—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.*

[3] "Nunc autem, cum per Dei gratiam . . . in ingenuam libertatem resurgit Ecclesia."—*Cod. Conc.*, ap. BARON., ad ann. 1106, c. 33.

[4] "Nos vero id est Alpium transcessores, speciali quodam efferebamur tripudio, eo quod certi essemus D. Apostolici profectionem sic fuisse dispositam," &c.—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.*

[5] Many facts show that then, as in the pontificate of Gregory VII., there was still, in Lombardy, a centre of opposition to the Holy See, and of lively sympathy for the imperialist schism. Affairs moved slowly towards that union between the papacy and the Lombard towns which produced such great results in the second half of the twelfth century. If space allowed we might recount the noble efforts made at Milan by the priest Luitprand, whose nose and ears the schismatics cut off, and who endured the trial by fire like St. Peter Igneus, to obtain the exclusion of the simoniacal Archbishop Grossulanus.—(LANDULPHI *junioris in Muratori Script.*, vol. v.; PAGI, *crit.* in BARON., 1100, 1103, 1105.) We wish only to point out again one of those liberties which Protestant and philosophical historians permit themselves when they speak of men devoted to the cause of the Church. STENTZEL (vol. i. p. 568), speaking of this Luitprand, calls him a *savage*—a name which suits not the victim but the schismatics who cut off his nose and ears; thus it is the victim,

significant symptoms, made him doubt what his reception would be after the promulgation of his last decree.[1] He preferred, therefore, to turn towards Burgundy, and pass the feast of Christmas under the ever-hospitable roof of his old brethren of Cluny.[2]

not the executioner, who is the savage. Then, relating an interview between the priest and the young King Conrad, Stentzel says that the young prince, then in rebellion against his father, answered him *with bitterness*, and quotes as his authority LANDULPHI *jun.*, c. i.; but when we consult this author in *Muratori*, vol. v., we find that Conrad speaks to Luitprand *cum devotione*. This Stentzel translates *Mit Bitterkeit*. These are minutiæ perhaps; but they show the author's general disposition and that of his school.

[1] "Quod non facile gens nostra decretum illud recipiat . . ."—*Ibid.*

[2] "Et natalis Dominici gaudium sua præsentia Cluniacensibus multum ampliavit."—*Ibid.*

CHAPTER IX

FRANCE ALWAYS ORTHODOX, AND CLUNY ALWAYS UNRIVALLED

In the war of investitures both victors and vanquished turned to France. —Devotion to St. Benedict among the descendants of Hugh Capet. —Journeys of Pope Pascal II. through different parts of France.—Pascal at Charité-sur-Loire and at St. Denis.—The tree planted by St. Benedict spreads its branches over France.—Foundations of Robert d'Arbrissel.—Bernard de Tiron in Perche.—Conversions worked by St. Vital.—Death of Abbot Hugh of Cluny.—Vision of Fulgence of Affligliem.—Bernard of Cluny in Spain.

THUS, in the course of this great struggle, the victor and the vanquished, the Emperor Henry and Pope Pascal, alike directed their thoughts and wishes towards France and towards Cluny—to the kingdom which was always orthodox, and to the abbey which never had a rival. It was the support of the King of France that Henry chiefly invoked to avenge the outraged rights of royalty; it was the holy Abbot Hugh of Cluny whom he called upon to act as mediator between him and the princes. And it was also under the ægis of France and under the crosier of St. Hugh that Pascal II. sought for men to aid him in the final settlement of the question of investiture,[1] turning thither rather than to Germany, where the most terrible enemy of the Church had just fallen.

After the reconciliation of Philip I. with the Church in

[1] Suger says expressly: "Ut regem Francorum et filium regem designatum et Ecclesiam Gallicanam consuleret super quibusdam molestiis, et novis investituræ Ecclesiasticæ querelis quibus eis infestabat, et magis infestare minabatur Henricus imperator."—*De Vita Ludovici Grossi*, c. ix.

1104, French royalty had returned to its natural paths, and again assumed in the eyes of nations that habitual character of tender and ardent devotion towards the Church, and especially towards the Monastic Orders, which distinguished the princes of the house of Capet when the passion of love did not lead them astray.[1]

When Philip I. died,[2] after a reign of forty-eight years, he, like his ancestor Hugh Capet, could confidently invoke the powerful protection of St. Benedict. He desired that he might be buried near the relics of the great monk at the abbey of Fleury-sur-Loire. "I know," he said, "that the burial-place of the French kings is at St. Denis; but as I own that I have been a hardened sinner, I dare not be buried near so great a martyr. I fear lest, on account of my faults, I should be given up to Satan and share the fate of Charles Martel. . . . But confiding in St. Benedict, I invoke the venerable father of monks, and I desire to be buried in his church on the Loire; for Benedict is full of clemency, and I know that he will give a welcome to all sinners who, wishing to amend their lives, have recourse to his rule to reconcile them to God." [3]

Already in the previous year, Louis, eldest son of the king, and associated with him in the sovereignty, had gone to assist at the raising of the body of the monastic patriarch, whose relics had been placed in a richer shrine: the story of the tears of joy and devotion shed at the sight of this precious treasure by the young king and the French lords had been faithfully related in the annals of the monastery.[4]

[1] Robert and Bertha, Philip I. and Bertrade. See the wise reflections on this subject in MICHELET, *Hist. de France*, vol. ii. p. 149, &c.

[2] July 30, 1108.

[3] "Sanctum Benedictum diligo, pium patrem monachorum suppliciter exposco, et in ecclesia ejus super Ligerim tumulari desidero. Ipse enim clemens est et benignus, omnesque suscipit peccatores propitius, qui," &c. —ORDER. VITAL., b. xi. p. 835, ed. Duchesne.

[4] "Ludovicus rex designatus, cum multis proceribus Franciæ regni, et communi lætitiæ suam conjunxit. . . . Illic vidi flentes præ gaudio regem et principes, et omne vulgus; præcipue monachos et abbates,

Scarcely had Louis ascended the throne when he solemnly announced his intention to seek before all things the kingdom of God and His righteousness, by defending religion and protecting churches and monks ;[1] and the clergy repaid thenceforward his filial devotion by giving him the most faithful support.

On the death of the old king, Yves of Chartres summoned the assembly of barons, to confirm by a new election Louis's right to the crown, which he had already worn in his father's lifetime.[2] The prelate convoked all the bishops who, like himself, were suffragans of Sens, and, in spite of the remonstrances of the metropolitan of Rheims, who claimed the exclusive right to perform the ceremony, hastily consecrated the young king at Orleans,[3] so as to cut short all pretensions hostile to his sovereignty.[4] Louis was then

hymnos et laudes, ut decebat, dicere volentes, sed sine lacrymis non valentes. . . . Levatum itaque gazophylacium auro et argento gemmisque omnibus carius."—*Chron. S. Petri Vivi Senon.*, ad. ann. 1107.

[1] "In exordio nostri principatus quam proxime nostri interesse officii primum quærere regnum Dei et justitiam ejus considerans, ad incrementum nostræ salutis tam corporis quam animæ credimus proficere, si Ecclesiis sanctorum et monasteriis studuerimus non solum de nostris possessionibus largiri," &c.—*Diplom. pro monast. S. Quintini de Monte*, in *Ampl. Collect.*, p. 623.

[2] It is well known that then, and up to the time of St. Louis, the hereditary succession of the kings of France needed to be confirmed by the consecration—a ceremony in which the exchange of oaths and the consent of the bishops and barons recalled the ancient elective right merged into hereditary royalty. There was therefore little difference between the law of succession to the German empire and royalty and the law recognised in France. Philip I. had caused his son to be elected in his lifetime, as Henry IV. had done, which did not prevent either Louis le Gros or Henry IV. from requiring a new election on succeeding their fathers.

[3] "Ad regni fastigia sicut bonorum voto adsciscitur, sic malorum et impiorum votiva machinatione, si fieri posset, excluderetur. Consulti ergo proceres, et potissimum dictante venerabili ac sapientissimo Yvone . . . ut ad repellendam impiorum machinationem citissime Aurelianos conveniant, ejus exaltationis operam dare festinant. Senonensis igitur archiepiscopus invitatus, cum comprovincialibus, videlicet Walone Parisiensi episcopo," &c.—SUGER, *De Vita Ludov. Gross.*, c. 12.

[4] See the fine letter of Yves to Pascal II., against the pretensions of

glad to invoke the aid of that Wallon, Bishop of Paris, whom he had formerly sworn should never reach the episcopate. The prince's heart had been happily changed. He now regarded himself as girded not only with the temporal but also with the spiritual sword for the defence alike of the Church and of the poor.[1]

The king long profited by the wise counsels of Yves of Chartres.[2] Not content with the moral support given him by the bishops, he found the contingents which, as lords of lands they were able to furnish to him, useful instruments in his struggles with the lay vassals, whose violence and brigandage desolated his realms.[3] Henry I., King of England—now, thanks to his reconciliation with Anselm of Canterbury and his defeat of his elder brother Robert,[4] become Duke of Normandy—had also by his vigorous proceedings against the robbers gained the sympathy of the bishops and monasteries of that country,[5] as well as that of

Rheims, which had appealed to the pope. He says in it: "Si consecratio regis differretur, regni status et Ecclesiæ pax graviter periclitaretur." The see of Rheims was then occupied by a celebrated Benedictine, Raoul le Vert, friend of St. Bruno, whom the latter had vainly endeavoured to attach to his new order, but who had become a monk at St. Rémy. He was elected archbishop in 1108, and governed for sixteen years.

[1] The words used by Suger are remarkable: "Qui (archiepiscopus) . . . sacratissimæ unctionis liquore delibatum regem . . . abjectoque secularis militiæ gladio *Ecclesiastico ad vindictam malefactorum eum accingens*, diademate regni gratanter coronavit, necnon et sceptrum et virgam, et per hæc Ecclesiarum et pauperum defensionem, et quæcumque regni insignia, approbante clero et populo, devotissime contradidit."—*De Vita Ludov. Grossi, loc. cit.*

[2] See the letters addressed to him by Yves to dissuade him from an unequal marriage, which would have given his great vassals an excuse for renouncing their allegiance (Ep. 209); to persuade him to marry the niece of the Count of Flanders (Ep. 239); to beg from him the pardon of the Commune of Beauvais (Ep. 263 and 264); to reprove him severely for his avarice (Ep. 202).

[3] "Ad comprimendum tyrannidem prædonum et seditiosorum, auxilium totam per Galliam deposcere coactus est episcoporum."—ORDER. VITAL., b. xi. p. 836.

[4] At Tenchebray.

[5] "Auditis rumoribus de victoria regis, religiosi quique lætati sunt."

those barons who desired that the abbeys should not be despoiled of the property with which their pious ancestors had endowed them.[1]

The two kings were thus engaged in the same Christian work—the defence of the Church and their people. Unfortunately, their success was of little benefit to the population; for, if we may believe an impartial judge, the royal officers who were substituted for the seigneurs embittered by their exactions and arbitrary prosecutions the fate of those peasants to whom the yoke of sergeants and legists in the pay of royalty was far more bitter than that of the nobles.[2]

Such was the state of France when, in the last year of the reign of King Philip, Pope Pascal, in imitation of his predecessor Urban II., decided upon one of those apostolic pilgrimages in which a monk, raised to the papacy, understood how to warm the fervour of the people, to regenerate ecclesiastical discipline, to repress local usurpation, and to confirm the rights and liberties of the monasteries. Everywhere in France the pontiff was welcomed with profound veneration as a heavenly legislator, and everywhere he

—ORDER. VIT., b. xi. p. 821. It was against his will that the pope favoured Robert, who had first compromised his duchy by his zeal for the Crusade.

[1] Thus Elie de la Flèche, Count of Mans, in the discussion with Robert of Bellesme, who urged Robert's rights as the elder, opposed to him the *ignavia* of the prince, adding, "Hinc turbæ pauperum pulsæ sunt in exilium . . . et rebus ac prædiis quæ pii barones antea dederant, spoliata sunt monachorum cœnobia."—ORDER. VIT., xi. 822. The Counts of Mans, Evreux, and Meulan, the Sires de Conches and de Montfort, William de Warenne, and Robert de Grantmesnil—that is to say, the principal Norman nobles—were for Henry. Robert had on his side only Robert de Bellesme, Grand Billard, the Count de Morteuil, and Robert d'Estouteville.

[2] "Insolitas exactiones imponebant, ac pro libitu suo judicia pervertebant: summis et mediocribus multas gravedines inferebant, sed hæc non sua virtute, imo timore regis et potestate agitabant. . . . Officiales mali prædonibus pejores sunt. Pagenses nempe latrunculos, fugiendo sive divertendo devitare possunt; versipelles vero bedellos nullatenus sine damno declinare queunt."—ORDER. VITAL., b. xii. p. 876.

showed a truly apostolic solicitude for the faithful and for the churches.[1]

After having spent the winter of 1106–1107 at Cluny, Pascal travelled towards Paris, consecrating on his way the newly-finished monastic churches.[2] At St. Benigne,

[1] "Ab universis finium illarum Ecclesiis, ut vere Christi discipulus, et Apostolicus vicarius, ingenti honore suscipitur . . . non aliter quam legifer de cœlo missus auditur. Sic igitur . . . ut fidelis dispensator et prudens, quotidianam sollicitudinem omnium Ecclesiarum gerens."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1107.

[2] The itinerary of Pascal's travels in France is not so easy to settle as that of his predecessor Urban II., or his successors Calixtus II. and Innocent II. Here is all we have been able to ascertain:—

1106, Dec. 25.—Celebration of Christmas at Cluny.
1107, Feb. 8.—At St. Hippolyte. Deed of confirmation of the possessions and immunities of Cluny.—Ep. *Pasch.* No. 69, in *Conc.*, vol. xii.
Feb. 16.—At Dijon. Dedication of church of St. Benigne.—MS. St. Ben. in Chifflet., *De g. ill. S. Benen.*
„ 18.—At Bèze. Dedication of abbey church.—PAGI, *Crit.*, in 1107.
„ At Langres. Confirmation of the election of Laon.
March 15.—At Charité-sur-Loire. Dedication of abbey church.—*Chron Fiscann.*, in LABBE, *Bibl. MS.*, vol. i.
„ At Déols-en-Berry. Dedication of abbey church.
„ 24.—At Tours. *Lætare* Sunday. The pope officiates pontifically at St. Martin of Tours.—SUGER, *De vit. Lud. Gross.*
April 14.—At Chartres. Easter celebrated by Pascal with Yves of Chartres.—ORDER. VIT., b. xi. p. 810.
„ At St. Denis. Interviews with Kings Philip and Louis.—SUGER, *loc. cit.*
„ At Châlons-sur-Marne. Interview with ambassadors of Henry V.—*Ibid.*
May 23.—At Troyes. Council and new condemnation of investitures.—*Chron. Ursperg.*, *ibid.*
„ 25.—(?) At Souvigny. Deed in favour of Cluny.—Ep. 71, in *Concil.*, vol. xii., ed. COLETTI, p. 1028, and *Bibl. Cluniac.*, p. 550.
August 4.—At Aiguebelles (*Aquam Bellam*). New deed in favour of Cluny.—Ep. 70, *ibid.*
Sept. 1.—At Modena.
„ 18.—At Fiésole.
„ 24.—At Florence.

It is impossible to reconcile the date of the deed given at Souvigny, May 25, according to the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, edition of the *Councils*

at Dijon, the pope dedicated the magnificent basilica, which still exists, and which Abbot Jarenton had opened as a safe asylum for the Lorraine monks persecuted for the cause of the Church.[1] At Bèze, an old and famous abbey of Burgundy, where for twenty years Abbot Etienne[2] had laboured to reform his monks, had increased their number tenfold, and had created a nursery of pious abbots, Pascal spent three full days, delighted with the good order, the beautiful situation, and exact discipline of the house: he himself held the monastic chapter; preached to the monks the virtue of patience, which was so necessary to them; and after his discourse, sang the *Miserere*, at the abbot's request, and gave the solemn absolution and pontifical benediction; after which he consecrated the altar of St. Peter and St. Paul, in presence of five cardinals, five bishops, and a crowd of abbots, clerks, and believers.[3] At La Charité-sur-Loire,

of Coletti, with the holding of the Councils of Troyes on Ascension Day, which this year fell on the 23rd of the same month. The pope could not have reached Souvigny, in the Bourbonnais, the day after his departure from Troyes. It is known, however, that he did go to Souvigny, and that Hildebert of Mans was there with him, for he is named among the bishops who witnessed the deeds, and it was there that Pascal dissuaded Hildebert from his project of relinquishing the episcopate.—See D. BEAUGENDRE, *Not. in Epist. Hildeberti*, b. iii. No. 7, p. 17. In the *Life of Hildebert* (p. xxii.), De Beaugendre says the meeting took place at *Savigny;* but this abbey, in the Lyonnais, was yet further from Troyes than Souvigny. The difficulty can only be removed by supposing a printer's error in the two works of Marrier and Coletti, and substituting July for June in the date 8th of the Kalends of June, which they both give, or in admitting, like the *Chroniele of St. Benigne* (in LABBE, vol. i.), that the Council of Troyes took place on the Ides of May, the 15th.

[1] See above, the relations of St. Benigne with Hirschau (St. Vanne . . . ?).

[2] It was he who, born of a knightly race, had abandoned the career of arms to become a monk, after the example of Count Simon of Valois. See above.

[3] "Omnia laudans, omnia benedicens, ad ultimum in capitulum veniens consedit, ubi sermonem faciens (he took for text verse 4 of chap. xv. of the Epistle to the Romans). . . . Et quia monachis loquebatur quibus maxime necessaria patientia est, eam posuit quasi fundamentum."—*Chron. Besuense*, in *Spicileg.*, vol. ii. p. 444.

a dependency of Cluny—but a gigantic dependency, almost rivalling its metropolitan—the pope performed the same ceremony amidst a great concourse of bishops and barons, among whom was a low-born monk of St. Denis, named Suger, who was destined to carry the precious memory of this journey to the royal monastery which he was to govern as abbot, and whence he was to be called to govern France.[1]

From La Charité the sovereign pontiff went to Tours; and then, for the feast of Easter, to the town of Chartres, whither he was invited by the great bishop. Yves, with the respectful but complete frankness of the men of his time, did not spare the head of the Church his most critical observations, but at the same time testified towards him the purest and most absolute devotion. The Countess Adela of Blois, daughter of William the Conqueror, herself chose to provide for all the pope's expenses.[2]

Pascal then visited the great and royal abbey of St. Denis, which he regarded as St. Peter's special portion in France,[3] and there again renewed the alliance between the papacy and French royalty. The pope edified all present by his fervent devotion before the relics of the apostle of the Gauls, and by the disinterestedness—"very unlike a Roman," says Suger—with which he disdained all the treasures of the rich monastery, accepting no other present than a part of the saint's episcopal garments, which still bore the trace of his blood.[4]

[1] "Celeberrimo archiepiscoporum . . . conventu . . . affuerunt et nobiliores regni proceres . . . cui consecrationi et nos ipsi interfuimus."—SUGER, *De Vit. Lud.*, vi. 9. He was born at St. Denis. His obscure birth is proved by himself when he says that he was elected "contra spem meriti, morum et generis," and in many other passages.—Ap. DUCHESNE, *Script.*, vol. v. pp. 343, 354, *et passim.*

[2] ORDER. VITAL., b. xi. p. 810.

[3] "Tanquam ad propriam B. Petri sedem."—SUGER, *loc. cit.*

[4] "Hoc memorabile, et Romanis insolitum, et posteris reliquit exemplum, quod nec aurum . . . quod multum timebatur . . . non tantum non affectabat, sed nec respicere dignabatur. . . . Sanctorum pignoribus humillime prostratus, lacrymas compunctionis offerebat. . . . Ne dis-

After public homage had thus been rendered by the head of the Church militant to the pontiff-martyr, elect of the Church triumphant, the two kings in their turn, filled with the love of God, came to lay their crown humbly before the successor of Peter the fisherman.[1] Pascal implored their help against tyrants, begging them to lend a hand to the defence of the Church, as was fitting for successors of Charlemagne and pious kings of France.[2] The two sovereigns swore to give aid and assistance, and placed their kingdom at his disposal;[3] afterwards they invited from the monastery several prelates, and among others Adam, Abbot of St. Denis, whom Suger had accompanied to Tours, that they might attend them to Châlons, where they were to have a decisive interview with King Henry's ambassadors.

Pascal found in France succour yet more efficacious than that of the royal goodwill from the ever-living fervour and zeal of the Monastic Orders, whence, as under Gregory VII., the champions of the Church constantly recruited their numbers. The old tree planted by St. Benedict, far from withering in France, put forth there, even more than elsewhere, vigorous branches, which, trained by skilful hands, took here and there new aspects. Thus arose the order of Grandmont, and that of the Chartreux; thus the order of the Cistercians, sown in an obscure corner of Burgundy, burst into brilliant life. At the time when Pascal II. visited

pliceat, inquiens, si de vestimentis ejus nobis vel parum reddideritis, qui eum vobis apostolatu Galliæ insignitum absque munere destinavimus."—SUGER, *loc. cit.*

[1] "Gratanter et votive, amore Dei majestatem regiam pedibus ejus incurvantes, quemadmodum consueverunt ad sepulcrum piscatoris Petri reges submisso diademate inclinari. Quos dominus papa manu erigens. . . ."—*Ibid.*

[2] "De statu Ecclesiæ, ut sapiens sapienter agens . . . eosque blande demulcens. . . . Ecclesiam manu tenere, et sicut antecessorum regum Francorum Caroli Magni, &c., . . . tyrannis et Ecclesiæ hostibus, et potissimum Henrico audacter resistere."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Qui amicitiæ, auxilii et consilii dextras dederunt, regnum exposuerunt."—*Ibid.*

the province so highly honoured by the virtues of Yves of Chartres and Hildebert of Mans, three new foundations, due to three holy friends, were beginning to attract the respect of the faithful and to promise new support to the Gallican episcopate.

The Breton Robert of Arbrissel, whose courage had been so remarkable at the Council of Poitiers[1] in 1100, after having been arch-priest of Rennes and schoolmaster at Angers, had quitted the world to live as a hermit in the forest of Craon, in Anjou, where he directed an abbey of regular canons. Urban II. having called him thence, to preach in the neighbouring dioceses, Robert travelled through Normandy, Bretagne, Anjou, and Touraine. He fulfilled his mission with brilliant success, drawing after him great troops of penitents of both sexes, who encamped in the woods, so as to be within hearing of the holy preacher. Robert, with unheard-of boldness, rebuked all disorders, even those of certain of his ecclesiastical superiors. Some imprudences committed by the wandering crowd of men and women, in the midst of which the ardent missionary lived day and night, and above all, the sometimes excessive zeal which he showed for the conversion of fallen women,[2] drew upon him the severe reproofs of Geoffrey, Abbot of Vendôme, and of the learned Marbodius, Bishop of Rennes.[3] Robert was then obliged to seek some desert where his strange flock

[1] See above. He was born in 1047.

[2] Cf. BALDRIC., *Vit. S. Roberti*, ap. *Act. SS. Bolland.*, vol. ii., February; GUILLELM. NEUBRIG., *De rebus Anglicis*, b. i. c. 15; *Clypeus Fontebraldensis*, vol. ii. p. 132; MASSION, *Notice sur Robert d'Arbrissel.*

[3] Mabillon, in his *Annals* (b. lxix. No. 139), admits the authenticity of these two famous letters, which have been used to throw ridicule on the venerable founder; but he shows that they are anterior to the establishment of Fontevrault, and that no conclusion unfavourable to Robert's morals can be drawn from them (cf. *Acta SS. Bolland.*, 25th February, vol. ii. p. 601). Noël Alexander, in a learned and impartial dissertation (*Hist. Eccles.*, sects. xi. and xii., dissert. 5, vol. vi.), arrives at the same conclusions, except that he does not admit the letter of Marbodius to have been written by that prelate.

could live without scandal. One day in a forest, on the confines of Anjou and Lorraine, he met some robbers, whose chief, Evrault, demanded his money. "Willingly," replied the apostle; "but, in exchange, you must give me your souls for God." The saint converted them; and thenceforward established, in this forest, the centre of his new foundation, which, from the name of the brigand chief, he called Fontevrault.[1]

Here there soon assembled more than 3000 converts,[2] of both sexes, who lived absolutely apart. Nobles and peasants, lepers and courtesans, old and young, inhabited the huts built of branches, under Robert's sole guidance,[3] and remained thus until the day when the generosity of neighbouring nobles gave their founder the means of building a great monastery, which he divided into four separate quarters. In 1106 Pascal approved this foundation, of which Robert d'Arbrissel became superior-general, and to which were attached several other houses founded by him in different provinces. But at his death, to do honour to the Virgin, whom he had chosen as special protectress of this branch of the Benedictine order, he desired that the brothers of all his houses should acknowledge the supremacy of the Abbess of Fontevrault,[4] where, in the time of Suger, there were four or

[1] A noble lady named Aremburge furnished him with the means.

[2] According to others, there were 5000.—*Clypeus Fontebraldensis.*

[3] "Nec incertas nec pellices refutabant . . . leprosos . . . impotentes . . . pauperes et nobiles . . . viduæ et virgines. . . . Innumeram copiositatem capiebant tuguriola. . . ."—BALDRIC., cc. 4 and 2, *loc. cit.*

[4] According to Mabillon, the first abbess was Hersende de Clairvaux, widow of William de Montsoreau; and according to Fleury (b. lxvi. No. 34) and the *Hist. litt.* (vol. x. p. 162), Pétronille de Craon. Baronius (ad ann. 1117) enumerates the eleven daughters, grand-daughters, and sisters of kings who were abbesses of this famous monastery. Fontevrault, like Mont St. Michel and Clairvaux, is now transformed into a central house of detention for both sexes. The tower called that of Evrault, and the choir of the magnificent church, have alone been spared. In 1831 we saw the tombs of Richard Cœur de Lion and Henry I. in the most shameful state of neglect. Since then, these tombs have been taken away and carried to Versailles, where they are now mixed up with other fragments of the same kind.

five thousand nuns. In the forest of Craon, whither Robert had first retired, he had been joined by a Picard monk named Bernard, who had fled from the dignity of abbot, which the monks of St. Savin had desired to bestow on him. But later, the good monk could not escape from the choice of the brothers of St. Cyprian at Poitiers. Once made an abbot, Bernard performed his new duties with energy. At the Council of Poitiers, he, like his friend Robert, distinguished himself by the most intrepid resistance to the violence of Duke William. When the Abbey of Cluny claimed St. Cyprian as one of its dependencies, Bernard laid down his office and went to join Robert d'Arbrissel and his fellow-labourers in preaching, at the risk of his life, against the scandalous priests of Normandy, whose wives several times endeavoured to have him killed.[1]

Meantime the monks of St. Cyprian, who were struggling with all their power against the pretensions of Cluny, gained from their old abbot a promise to go and plead their cause at Rome. He made two journeys thither, riding an ass, and wearing the poor dress of a hermit. At first well received, and afterwards repulsed, but always firmly convinced of the goodness of his cause, Bernard maintained his plea, even against the pope himself, and did not fear to cite him before the tribunal of God.[2] Pascal, though offended, soon suffered himself to be appeased by the two cardinal-legates Benedict and John, who, themselves monks, had been able to appreciate the virtue and courage shown at the Council of Poitiers by Bernard. He was allowed, therefore, to recommence his pleading before the pope and the pontifical council, in which he argued that St. Cyprian had flourished long before the

[1] "Unde factum est ut uxores presbyterorum, metuentes ab iis disjungi, cum suis auxiliariis eum perimere quærerent."—GAUFR. GROSS., *Vita S. Bernardi Tiron.*, ap. BOLLAND., die 14 April, c. 6.

[2] "Et quia sicut scriptum est: *Justus nullo confidit*, in Romana synodo contra Paschalem papam pro libertate litigavit; ipsumque, quia plenarium sibi rectum non fecerat, ad divinum examen provocavit."—ORDER. VITAL., b. viii. p. 715.

birth of Cluny, and that Abbot Hugh was coveting a spouse not his own, and usurping, without justification, the hitherto unknown title of arch-abbot.[1] Bernard gained his cause. Pascal confirmed the freedom of St. Cyprian, and wished to retain Bernard near him as a cardinal. But Bernard asked, as the only favour, that he might be released from his abbacy, which was granted. On his return to France, after having met with those trials and persecutions which are, in this world, the conditions of all true success in the work of God, he at last found at Tiron, in a forest of Perche, a retreat which suited him. The Count Rotrou gave him the property, and Yves of Chartres came thither to install him.[2] Very soon a hundred monks assembled round him, and a hundred *cells*[3] or priories formed a new congregation, which, placed under the rule of St. Benedict, bore henceforth, as did Bernard himself, the name of Tiron. The people of the neighbourhood, seeing this new species of hermits, even more poorly dressed than the old monks, first thought they were Saracens, come thither underground, and afterwards that they were prophets, like John the Baptist. Bernard made use of the curiosity of these half-savage country-people for their conversion; he delighted to recruit his monastic army among labourers and artisans, who continued their trades in the monastery. And while carpenters and masons, painters and sculptors, jewellers and smiths, ploughmen and vine-dressers, found at Tiron such work as suited them,[4] the

[1] "Nunc autem Cluniacensis abbas, juxta Isaiæ vaticinium, ad uxorem meam hinnire non desinit. . . . Archiabbatis nomen usurpans."—MABIL., *Ann.*, b. lxxi. c. 17.

[2] Easter-day 1109.

[3] "Centum cellæ."—GAUFR. GROSS., *Vit. S. Bernardi*, No. 52. Fleury, after *Gall. Christ.* (vol. iv., p. 864), counts but 12 abbeys, 48 priories, and 22 parishes.

[4] "Singulas artes quas noverant, legitimas in monasterio exercere præcepit. Unde libenter convenerunt ad eum tam fabri lignarii quam ferrarii, sculptores et aurifabri, pictores et cæmentarii, vinitores et agricolæ, multorumque officiorum artifices peritissimi."—ORDER. VITAL., b. viii. p. 715.

fame of the new foundation spread widely, and so deeply touched the hearts of the great barons, that when, at the end of a year, a great scarcity happened, Count William of Nevers sent to Abbot Bernard a large golden vase, that he might sell it and devote the product to feeding his monks and the poor. Thus, in spite of the absence of roads or canals, Christian charity found a way for itself from the confines of Burgundy to the unexplored solitudes of la Perche![1]

Another saint, destined to become the father of a third congregation, issued also from the forest of Craon, where the love of penance had united him to Robert d'Arbrissel and Bernard of Tiron. This third personage was of Norman descent and was called Vital.[2] He also was of low birth.[3] More austere even than his two comrades, Vital soon drew more than one hundred and fifty-six disciples round him, and Raoul, Viscount of Fougères, gave up to them the whole forest of Savigny, near Avranches, with the ruins of an old castle which they turned into a monastery.[4]

[1] MABILL., *Ann.*, b. lxxi. c. 40. In 1113, Bernard de Tiron was able to send a monastic colony to Wales. Later we shall see the son of the King of Scotland come to him in search of monks.

[2] The MS. Life of the B. Vital, composed in the twelfth century by Etienne de Fougères, Bishop of Rennes, and which the writers who continued the *Hist. litter. de France* believed to be lost, has been found by M. L. Delisle, pupil of the École de Chartes, who has kindly given us a copy of it. The bishop declares that he writes from memoirs drawn up in French by disciples of the saint: "Hæc enim, sicut Romane scripta referimus, Latino eloquio fideliter transferentes litteris evidentioribus tradidimus."

[3] His parents, however, who were of the diocese of Bayeux, and of the town of *Tirgerii*, had some property ("vitamque enam ex justis laboribus transigendo," ET DE FOUG., c. i.), which he sold, and gave the price to the poor. From his childhood he was so grave that his playfellows called him *The little Abbot*. He began by being chaplain to Robert, Count of Mortain, half-brother of William the Conqueror.—FLEURY, b. lxvi. c. 19; ETIENNE DE FOUGÈRES, *Vit.* MS., *passim*.

[4] Vital retired to the forest of Savigny in 1105; but the deed of gift by Raoul de Fougères was in 1112; it was confirmed by Henry I., and by the bull of Pascal II., March 23, 1113.—Cf. FLEURY, b. lxvi. c. 19; MABILL., b. lxx. c. 95; ORDER. VIT., p. 715.

This new foundation became in its turn the cradle and capital of thirty-one great abbeys in England and France. Vital, a man of powerful eloquence, often left his solitude to preach the word of God among the Norman nobles, who, since one of them had conquered England, were giving themselves up to the charms of ambition, and often left the path trodden by their ancient heroes.[1] Vital joined great courage and hardihood to his eloquence. His stern reproofs spared no one. At first he terrified his auditors; those who went to hear him out of curiosity usually returned pale, disturbed, and confused at having heard the faults they supposed they had dissimulated, unveiled in public. The apostle, adds the hagiographer, made the proudest lords tremble as much as the roughest peasants, country girls as much as the noble ladies whom he reproved for the unbounded luxury of their silks and furs. The greatest seigneurs, and even the king himself, venerated the boldness of the holy man.[2] Counting upon their indulgence, he ventured to present himself, before the battle of Tenchebray, as mediator between the two brothers, King Henry and Duke Robert, whom, unfortunately, he was unable to reconcile.[3]

However fruitful and popular these new foundations might be, the splendour of Cluny did not pale before them. Thirty-five abbeys of the first rank received her laws, and

[1] "Antiqui optimates."—ORDER. VIT., b. viii. p. 708.

[2] "Fortitudine et facundia præditus et ad proferendum quicquid volebat animosus: non parcens in populari sermone infimis nec potentibus . . . annuntians populo Christiano scelera eorum. Reges igitur ducesque reverebantur eum. Plures turbæ manicabant ut audirent verba ejus, quæ postmodum auditis ab illo latenter olim actis facinoribus, lugubres et confusæ redibant. . . . Omnis ordo intrinsecus pungebat ejus veridicis allegationibus. Omnis plebs contremiscebat coram illo. . . . Sic nimirum superbos athletas et indomitos vulgi cœtus plerumque comprimebat, atque locupletes heras sericis vestibus et canusinis pellibus delicate indutas trepidare cogebat, dum verbo Dei gladio in scelera sæviret pollutasque conscientias . . . grandissimoque divinæ animadversionis tonitru terreret."—*Id.*, b. xi. p. 820.

[3] "Audacter interdixit ne certarent cominus."—*Id.*, *loc. cit.*

were entirely subject to her;[1] eleven others, the chief in France, such as Vézelay, Moissac, and St. Gilles, had accepted her customs without entering into the bonds of subjection which, as is proved by the rebellion of St. Cyprian,[2] she drew tightly, and it was to her that the great ones of the world and of the Church turned for refuge when God touched their hearts. It was at Cluny that a Count of Bourges, who had pledged his county to King Philip to provide for the expenses of a Crusade, found a resting-place on his return from the Holy War, and from a terrible captivity becoming a monk by the advice of the pope.[3] Pascal, however, did not hesitate to dissuade Hildebert, Bishop of Mans, the worthy rival of Yves of Chartres in learning and piety, from the project he entertained of laying down his dignity and retiring to Cluny, where he hoped to escape the vexations inflicted on him by the Norman kings, and the Counts of Mans.[4] Soon after he had received the visit of the third monk of Cluny whom Providence had called to the throne of St. Peter,[5] the great and good Abbot Hugh, who for sixty years had presided over the destinies of the Queen Abbey, and enlisted more

[1] "Præcipua monasteria," according to the first bull of Pascal II. in 1099.

[2] Some years later, in 1112, Abbot Lambert of St. Bertin, who had introduced the reformation of Cluny into his abbey, went to Rome to ask for security against Abbot Pons of Cluny, who claimed, in his quality of spiritual father, to come with a *cortège* of one hundred mules and celebrate Easter there, *tanquam in proprio*.—MABILL., *Ann.*, b. lxxii. c. 44.

[3] ORDER. VIT., b. x. p. 795.

[4] "Cujus sinum, quasi reus eram, amplexus fuissem, si papa consultus pontificis onus amoliri permisisset."—*Hildebr.* Ep., b. 3. This illustrious bishop had gone to seek Pascal in Rome while the latter was travelling into France, and returned upon his steps to join him at last at the Abbey of Souvigny, in the Bourbonnais. In Italy he had been well received by Count Roger of Sicily, by Geoffrey of Mayence, and other Normans, who, faithful to their old predilections, had loaded him with presents for the churches of his diocese, and especially for his Cathedral of St. Julian, which he rebuilt, and which was dedicated in 1120.

[5] Gregory VII., Urban II., and Pascal II.

than ten thousand monks for the army of God,[1] went to rejoin in heaven his predecessors Odilon and Maïeu, Odo, and one of his dearest friends, St. Anselm, dead but eight days before him. These two admirable saints, so united during their lives, were to be united also in death. Anselm had gone "to the Easter Court of his Lord"[2] on Wednesday in Holy Week 1109; Hugh died on Easter Tuesday, after having celebrated for the last time on his deathbed the offices of the festival, and washed for the last time the feet of the poor. When his eyes seemed to be losing their sight, and his feeble voice showed that consciousness was leaving him, they asked him, while administering the viaticum, whether he recognised the life-giving body of the Lord. "Oh yes," he answered, "I recognise and I adore it." They carried him to the church and placed him on a bed of ashes, where the old soldier of Christ breathed his last, at the age of eighty-five,[3] leaving to his numerous family the joy of his triumph, the example of his life, and the hope of his intercession.[4] The very same night, the pious Abbot Fulgence of Afflighem saw in a dream two beds of gold (*lectuli*) carried to heaven by angels, and it was told him that one was destined for St. Anselm and the other for St. Hugh of Cluny.[5]

King Alfonso VI. of Castile, the great benefactor of the

[1] "Plus quam decem millia monachorum ad militiam Domini Sabaoth suscepit."—ORDER. VIT., b. xi. p. 839.

[2] "Ad Paschalem Domini tui curiam vadis."—EADM., *de Vit. Ansel.*, p. 25.

[3] April 29, 1109.

[4] "Veteranus ille Christi miles . . . si vivificatricem Domini carnem cognosceret: 'Cognosco,' iniquit, 'et adoro' . . . relinquens filiis gaudium de corona, exemplum de vita, spem de intercessione."—HILDEB., *lib. de ejus Vita* in Bibl. Clun., pp. 433–436. "Grandævus heros ad Christum, cui a pueritia militaverat, migravit."—ORDER. VITAL., *loc. cit.*

[5] *Chron. Affligh. in Spicil., loc. sup. cit.* The holy monk Godefroy, Bishop of Amiens, then in Italy to plead before the pope the cause of his church against the monks of St. Valery, had also, during the same night of the 29th April, the vision of a procession of saints, who went to meet their new companion.—*Bibl. Cluniac.*, p. 463.

Church of Cluny, whose claims Abbot Hugh had formerly broken, and who had remained his steady and grateful friend, soon followed him to the tomb.[1] He was buried, by his own desire, among the Benedictines of Sahagun (San Facundo).[2]

Again it was by the intrepid firmness of Bernard, Archbishop of Toledo, a monk of Cluny, that the capital and kingdom which the death of Alfonso had just greatly shaken was defended from invasion by the Moors.[3]

The rights of Donna Urraca, heiress of the deceased prince,[4] were contested by Alfonso of Arragon. The princess hoped to settle the difficulty by marrying her cousin; but Pascal commanded her to renounce this alliance, under pain of excommunication and deposition."[5]

After the Arragonese usurpation, Bernard of Toledo and the Abbot of Sahagun were torn from their sees, imprisoned, and exiled; but all this discord and violence which Pascal endeavoured to terminate by sending as legate to Spain a Benedictine abbot of Chiusa,[6] did not weaken the ardent faith in monastic prayers, which inflamed Castilian hearts, and which dictated to another Urraca, sister of the friend of St. Hugh, these words which are found in her charter of restoration of the Abbey of St. Peter at Estoncia:[7]

"Do Thou, Lord, who art infinitely great even in the smallest things, receive these humble gifts, and deign to set so much value on them that, when I come before Thee, Thou mayst grant me the great joy of Thy kingdom. It is to Thee, my God, that I offer this monastery built in honour

[1] See above.

[2] June 30, 1109.

[3] MARIANA, *Hist. Hispan.*, b. x. c. 8; PAGI, *Crit.*, ad ann. 1109, 1110.

[4] Widow of Count Raymond of Burgundy, and mother of Alfonso VII., who called himself Emperor of the Spains.

[5] "Ut a consortio Ecclesiæ et sæculari potestate privetur."—Ep. *Pasc.*, No. 21, ap. COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 993.

[6] MABILL., *Ann.*, b. lxxii. No. 27; and in the details, *Append.*, No. 82 of vol. v.

[7] Founded in 900 by King Garcias, and restored in 1099 by Donna Urraca, daughter of King Ferdinand of Castile and Leon.

of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and of Paul, the chosen vessel. . . . Thus, my beloved Redeemer Christ, I offer to Thee this house as an expiation for my sins, and when Thou shalt come with those apostles to judge the world, may their prayers move Thee to be a merciful Judge towards me; may they snatch me from the flames of hell, and bring me purified into the glory of heaven."[1]

[1] "Suscipe jam, Domine pie, qui immensus es in minimis. . . . Offero doque tibi, bone Deus, cœnobium . . . sic, sic, dilecte Redemptor meus Christe . . . ut me exiguam quam pretioso redemisti cruore. . . ." She then enumerates the ornaments and twelve *codices* which she gives, and concludes thus: "Accipe, Christe, hæc munera, et concede ut, cum judex adveneris et cum eisdem apostolis orbem judicaveris, eorum precibus pulsatus, mihi sis judex mitissimus."—*Hist. de l'Ordre de Saint-Benoît*, vol. iv. sc. 35; MABILL., *Ann.*, vol. v. b. lxix. No. 13.

CHAPTER X

THE POPE AND THE EMPEROR AT ROME

Henry V. restores all the expelled bishops to their sees.—A council at Troyes.—Marriage of Henry V. with Matilda of England.—Sack of Novara.—Dangerous proposition made by the pope.—The Church in Germany placed in a situation analogous to that of the churches of France.—Oath sworn to the pope by the emperor.—Unfair dealing of Henry V.—Protest of the bishops and abbots.—The pope given up to the soldiery.—Violence used towards him.—He is made prisoner. —Pascal yields to the emperor in order to save his servants.—He treats with the emperor and crowns him at Rome.—Henry V. visits Countess Matilda.

THE Church had great need to reinforce her armies, for she was on the eve of a trial such as she had never known through all the thousand years of her previous history, and about to encounter dangers more serious than had ever yet fallen to her lot. She had to expiate bitterly the fault of having accepted, even against a guilty father, the aid of an unnatural son. This son was preparing to turn against his mother the sword which she had blessed, and—what had never before been permitted to any other—it was to be given him for a time to overpower the liberty of the Church even in her most august sanctuary.

Henry V. had begun the restoration to their sees of all the orthodox bishops plundered by his father's friends, including the monks Eudes of Cambrai, and Gebhard of Constance, the indefatigable legate of Urban and Pascal.[1] But

[1] We may believe that the zeal of this famous bishop had cooled, if we judge from a letter of the pope, given by Neugart (*Cod. dipl. Aleman.*, No. 834), who attributes it to the year 1107, in which the pontiff strongly reproves Gebhard for not having gone to the Council of Guastalla, declaring that only the remembrance of his former services can save him from

scarcely had his authority been acknowledged by the majority, when this man who, at the meeting at Nordhausen, had appeared so humble that he would only take part in the deliberations of the bishops by their express invitation, and asked nothing but that the empire might return to unity and apostolic submission, all at once changed his behaviour and language, and claimed to invest the new bishops, who for the most part lent themselves to his usurpation. The monk Eudes of Cambrai refused to accept from a layman the crosier and ring which he had already received from a bishop when he was consecrated at the Council of Rheims.[1] Henry marched against Cambrai, obliged Eudes to take refuge in the monastery of Anchin,[2] restored the excommunicated Gaucher, and abolished the commune to which the citizens had sworn when they received back their lawful bishop;[3] he then advanced towards the frontier of France and Lorraine, sending forward ambassadors to summon the pope to concede to him the right of investiture. This embassy was composed of several prelates and nobles, who appeared rather prepared to intimate commands than to discuss matters reasonably:[4] the most notable were Duke Welf, who caused a sword to be carried before him, and used other means to make himself heard;[5] and the Arch-

the interdict laid upon the Archbishop of Mayence and his suffragans on account of their absence from the council: "Nolumus enim," says Pascal, "ut juventutis certamina tempore, quod absit, senectutis omittas."

[1] "Quia virgam et annulum quæ consecratus ab Ecclesia acceperat iterato ab Henrico accipere voluit."—ODON., *De blasph. in Spir. sanct.;* ap. PAGI, in ann. 1109.

[2] Where he died in 1113. These words are engraved on his tomb:—

"Fuit exul, Deo fidus,
Fulget cœlo sicut sidus."

He is honoured as Blessed.—ACTA SS. BOLL., June 19.

[3] Chron. de Cambrai, in *Script. Rer. Franc.*, vol. xiii. p. 455; and THIERRY, *Lettres sur l'histoire de France*, xiv.

[4] "Qui tumultuantes magis ad terrendum quam ad ratiocinandum missi viderentur."—SUG., *De Vita Lud. Gross.*, c. 9.

[5] "Cui gladius ubique præferebatur, . . . clamosus."—*Ibid.* This was the husband of Countess Matilda, but separated from her and her cause.

bishop of Trèves, who spoke French fluently.[1] The pope received them at Châlons-sur-Marne. The Archbishop of Trèves formally claimed for the emperor, in virtue of the ancient law of the empire, not only the power of approving or rejecting all candidates elected to the episcopate, but also the right of investiture and homage as an inseparable condition of the possession of regalia—that is, of towns, castles, and tolls subject to the imperial authority.[2] To this the pope sent, by the Bishop of Placentia, the following reply: "The Church, bought by the precious blood of Christ, and made free, may not again become a slave; if she cannot elect a bishop without the emperor's consent, she is no better than his servant, and the death of Christ is of no avail. If the prelate-elect is invested by the lay power with the crosier and ring which belong to the altar, it is a usurpation of the rights of God; and if the prelate subjects his hands, consecrated by the body and blood of our Lord, to the hands of a layman blood-stained from his sword, he derogates from his orders and his holy unction."[3]

The Germans, furious, and scarcely restrained by the presence of the French, cried out, "Not here, but at Rome, and with the sword, this quarrel must be decided."[4] And they returned to their master.[5]

[1] "Vir elegans et jocundus, eloquentiæ et sapientiæ copiosus, Gallicano cothurno exercitatus, facete peroravit."—SUG., *De Vita Lud. Gross.*, c. 9.

[2] "Pro regalibus, ut annulo et virga investiatur fidelitatem et hominium facere. . . . Etenim civitates et castella, marchias, thelonea, et quæque imperatoriæ dignitatis nullo modo aliter debere occupare."—SUGER, *loc. cit.*

[3] "Ecclesiam pretioso Jesu Christi sanguine redemptam et liberam constitutam, nullo modo iterato ancillari oportere. Si Ecclesia eo inconsulto prælatum eligere non possit, cassata Christi morte, ei serviliter subjacere; si virga et annulo, &c., . . . contra Deum ipsum usurpare; si sacratas Dominico corpori . . . ordini suo et sacræ unctioni derogare."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Theutonico impetu frendentes tumultuabant, et si tuto auderent, convicia . . . injurias inferrent. Non hic, sed Romæ gladiis determinabitur querela."—*Ibid.*

[5] Suger, an ocular witness of all these discussions, says that the pope again sent agents to the Chancellor Albert, the emperor's confidential minister, who had remained behind to treat with him more quietly.

From Châlons-sur-Marne the pope went to hold a council at Troyes.[1] As if the better to answer Henry's embassy, he there again confirmed several ecclesiastical elections, and the condemnation of investitures; the council also settled the Truce of God for the advantage of the Crusade, which the pope earnestly desired to encourage. Amidst these struggles with lay usurpation, the Church did not lose sight of the interests of the poor: one of the canons of the council forbade the burning of houses, or the carrying off of sheep and lambs[2] in private wars. By the advice of the synod, the pope condemned those German bishops who had been accomplices in Henry's pretensions. He excommunicated the intruders at Liège, Cambrai, and Verdun, saying of the latter, "Richard of Verdun has given himself up to the king, and we give him up to Satan."[3] He did not even spare the two principal adherents of the Roman Church, Ruthard of Mayence and the old legate Gebhard of Spires, who had had the weakness to retain cures, the investiture of which had been given by the king. But the simple threat of suspension recalled these prelates to their duty.[4] Pascal then appointed Henry a delay of a year to come and discuss the great cause in a general council at Rome, whither he himself slowly turned his steps,[5] and where the Romans, this time, received him with delight.[6]

Henry at first seemed to care little for this energetic action of the Roman Court. He devoted the years 1108

[1] "Universale concilium honorifice celebravit."—*Ibid.* It was on the feast of the Ascension, May 23, 1107.

[2] *Chron. Malleac.*, ad ann. 1107, in LABBE, *Bibl. nova MS.*

[3] "Fertur dixisse Richardum Virdunensem, qui se tradidit regiæ curiæ, et nos tradimus eum Satanæ."—LAURENT. LEOD., *Hist. episc. Virdun. in Spicil.*, b. xii.

[4] For these different sentences, cf. COLETTI, *Conc.*, vol. xii. p. 1135, 1136. MARTÈNE and DURAND, *Ampliss. Collect.*, vol. i. præf. and p. 618.

[5] "Cum amore Francorum," says Suger, "qui multum servierant, et timore Theutonicorum."

[6] "Tanto Romani tam cleri quam populi tripudiis suscipiebatur, acsi de mortuis redivivus crederetur."—*Ann. Saxo.*, ad 1107.

and 1109 to not very glorious expeditions against Hungary, and the Sclavonic princes of Bohemia and Silesia, who scarcely owned the suzerainty of the empire. Towards the end of 1109, he sent to the pope a new embassy, composed of the Archbishops of Cologne and Trèves, the Chancellor Albert, and other nobles, to treat for an accommodation which must necessarily precede the assumption of the imperial dignity, only due to the kings of Germany after they had been crowned by the sovereign pontiff. Pascal replied without in any way contradicting his former language, and with equal steadiness and good faith, that he would receive the king with the affection of a father if he would present himself at Rome as a Catholic sovereign, a son and a defender of the Church, and a friend of justice.[1]

In a diet held at Ratisbon,[2] Henry announced to the princes his intention of going to Italy to be crowned emperor, and at the same time to arrange, as might suit the sovereign pontiff, all that was required for the defence of the Church.[3] The princes, delighted with these pious and patriotic intentions, assured him, on oath, of their assistance.[4] He also obtained the support of the nobles of the western part of the empire in another assembly held at Utrecht,[5] where he celebrated his marriage with the young Princess Matilda, daughter of Henry I. of England. He thus formed an alliance with the most powerful of sovereigns outside the empire, with a prince who had himself long been in conflict with the Church, and who had but just submitted. This alliance might prove a serious danger

[1] "Omni paternitate, omni mansuetudine, eum se excepturum spondet, si ipse se, ut regem catholicum, . . . Romanæ sedi exhiberet."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1109.

[2] January 6, 1100.

[3] "Quatenus . . . ad omnia quæ defensio posceret Ecclesiastica ad nutum Apostolici promptum se demonstraret."—*Ibid.*, ad ann. 1110.

[4] "Arrectis animis omnium ad votum pie providi consulis et indubitati jam patriæ amatoris . . . sacramento nimis voluntario confirmatis."—*Ibid.*, *Ann. Saxo.*, &c.

[5] At Easter, April 10, 1110.

if Henry V. should break the promises he had made at Ratisbon.

Meanwhile the pope, to leave no doubt as to his resolution, and in spite of the king's preparation, renewed, in the council held at the Lateran, March 7th, the formal condemnation of investitures and of all lay intervention in the disposal of the property of the Church.[1] He also confirmed the canon, often renewed during the Catholic ages, which placed all the shipwrecked under the Church's protection, and excommunicated, as robbers and murderers, men who seized upon the fragments of a wreck. Pascal did not forget those who had been the devoted champions of his predecessors in most critical moments; he went to Apulia, and there called together Duke Roger, the Prince of Capua, and all the Norman counts who were vassals of the Church, and made them swear to assist him against Henry, in case of need. The leaders of the Roman nobility[3] entered into the same engagement. This done, the pope tranquilly awaited the king's arrival in Rome, deceived, no doubt, by the protestations of devotion to the Apostolic See which had produced so great an effect at Ratisbon.[4]

In the month of August, Henry crossed the Alps at the head of an immense army,[5] which comprised a chosen body

[1] "Si quis ergo principum vel aliorum laicorum dispositionem seu donationem rerum sive possessionum Ecclesiasticarum sibi vindicaverit, ut sacrilegus judicetur."—*Conc.*, b. xii. p. 1150, ed. COLETTI.

[2] "Quicumque res naufragorum diripiunt, ut raptores et fratrum necatores ab Ecclesiæ liminibus excludantur."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Ducem ac principem, omnesque Apuliæ comites evocans, cum eis paciscitur, ut si opus esset, contra Henricum imperatorem dimicent. . . . Omnes Romanorum proceres simili sacramento constrinxit."—PETR. DIAC., *Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 37.

[4] The Protestant Lüden, not knowing how to account for this quiet confidence on the part of the pope, declares that there must have existed some profound and secret plot arranged against Henry by the pope and his confidant Peter de Léon. But, unfortunately, he is obliged to own that he cannot guess in what this plot consisted.—Vol. ix. p. 383.

[5] "Immenso coacto exercitu."—PETR. DIAC., *loc. cit.*

of 30,000 horsemen.[1] The king also had with him a large number of clerks and learned doctors, all prepared to argue for the lay power against the doctors of the Church.[2] Since the time of his grandfather Henry III., that is to say for more than half a century, Italy had not seen so great or so formidable a display of force. The cities of Piedmont and Lombardy had profited by the weakened power of the German emperors, during their struggle with the Catholic princes, to increase their political liberty; they made war among themselves as if they were so many independent states. But between their cause and that of the Church there was not yet that fusion, that solidarity, which later procured for both such brilliant triumphs. Some of these warlike cities made a show of resistance to the invasion of the German sovereign, but the sack of Novara, the first town which refused to obey him, terrified the others. They opened their gates to him without resistance, all except proud Milan, where the priest Luitprand, mutilated for his faith, long maintained "a centre of orthodox resistance:" this town alone refused to pay him the money demanded of her.[3]

Having passed the Po to the plain of Roncaglia, where he encamped for six weeks, Henry received the homage of all his feudatories in this part of Italy. The great Countess

[1] "Circiter triginta millia equitum electorum."—*Vit. S. Conrad.*, ap. CANIS, *Thes. anecd.*, b. vi.

[2] "Literatis viris, paratis scilicet ad rationem omni poscenti reddendam."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1110. Among them was a Scotchman named David, called the imperial historiographer (he drew up the history of this expedition in three books; "*in regis gratiam magis quam historicum deceret, proclivem*," says William of Malmesbury), and afterwards Bishop of Bangor. —WILL. MALM., vol. v. p. 167, *Chron. Ursperg.* It seems that the emperor did not wish to neglect any means of supporting his pretensions, but Providence defeated him in small things as well as great, and the narrative of his official historian has perished.

[3] "Nobilis urbs sola Mediolanum populosa
Non servivit ei nummum, neque contulit æris."
—DOMNIZO, *Vit. Math.*, ii. 18.

Matilda alone did not present herself.[1] She did not, however, try to oppose the passage of the Alps, either because she felt herself too feeble, or because, like the pope, she was mistaken as to the king's intentions. As it was important for Henry to be assured at least of the princess's neutrality, he sent ambassadors to her, whom she received at the Castle of Bibianello, near Canossa, at the same time as a number of nobles from beyond the Alps, who were curious to see so extraordinary a woman. There was a sort of reconciliation between the Countess and the prince, but she would promise him no assistance that could prejudice the independence of the Church.[2] He continued his journey towards Rome through Tuscany; and was six weeks crossing the various chains of the Apennines. His army suffered cruelly from cold, while the violences of which it was guilty, especially towards churches and zealous Catholics, showed but too plainly the spirit of the enterprise.[3]

From Arezzo, which he had besieged and burned, Henry sent to the pope an embassy, headed by his chancellor, Albert, the Archbishop-elect of Mayence. A negotiation was begun with the pontifical plenipotentiaries, the chief of whom was Peter, son of Leo.[4]

[1] "Sola Mathildis erat, quia regem semper habebat
Exosum multum, certaminibusque repulsum."
—Domnizo, ii. 18.

[2] "Ultramontani proceres multi quoque clari
Ad quam venere, miraturi mulierem . . .
Utraque pars tandem pacem laudavit eamdem;
Sed contra Petrum non promisit fore secum."
—*Ibid.*

The *Chron. Ursperg.* says: "Comitissam per internuntios sibi subjectam, gratia sua propriisque justitiis, donavit."

[3] "Ecclesias destruere non cessavit, religiosos ac catholicos viros capere . . . a propriis sedibus expellere non desistebat. Sic impie agendo per Longobardiam et Tusciam usque pervenit."—Pandulph. Pisan., in *Vita Pasch II.* Ordericus Vitalis (b. x. p. 728) also speaks of the ravages committed by Henry's army, but supposes they were only on Matilda's possessions, which, after the treaty, seems improbable.

[4] Leo, the father of Peter, grandfather of the anti-pope Anaclete II.,

The discussion took place in the portico of St. Peter's.[1] The pope refused to crown Henry emperor until he had secured the peace of the Church by renouncing the right of investiture. Henry declared that he could not injure his crown and the empire by renouncing a right exercised for more than 300 years, and confirmed by 63 popes.[2] Then the pope proposed a solution equally new and important, and which plainly proved his good faith and the absolute disinterestedness of the Church in this vital question. He proposed to give up, in the name of the Church, all the possessions and *regalia* which she held from former emperors,[3] and to content himself modestly with tithes and oblations, for ever forbidding the German bishops, under pain of anathema, to occupy cities, duchies, counties, monasteries, tolls, markets, manors, castles, and rights of all kinds which were dependent on the empire, and comprised under the name of *regalia*.[4] In return for this concession, the future emperor, whom the pope promised to crown, was on

and founder of a very influential family, was of Jewish origin, and had become very powerful by his riches and his devotion to the Holy See. He had been able to ally himself with the most ancient Roman nobility, "*satus alto sanguine materno nobilitatis erat*," said his epitaph, composed by Archbishop Alfano of Salerno.

[1] "In porticu S. Petri" (PETR. DIAC., *Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 37). There was indeed an interruption. The first ambassadors sent from Arezzo returned to meet Henry V. at Acquapendente, bringing with them the Roman nuncios; then he sent others, who treated at Rome, and brought him the results of the negotiation to Sutri, whither he had advanced by short journeys, at the beginning of February IIII.

[2] "Regno nostro a Carolo trecentis et eo amplius annis et sub lxiii. Apostolicis investituras tenenti. . . . Et per nuntios eum nostros ab eo quæreretur, omnibus his sublatis quid de nobis fieret? in quo regnum nostrum constaret?"—Ep. *Henr. ad Parmenses, cod. Udalr.*, No. 261, apud ECKHARD, *Corp. histor.*, b. ii.

[3] "Omnia prædia et regalia quæ a Carolo et Ludovico, Ottone et Henrico . . . ecclesiis collata sunt."—PETR. DIAC., *loc. cit.*

[4] "Sub anathemate ne quis eorum . . . invadant eadem regalia et civitates, ducatus, marchias, comitatus, monetas, theloneum, mercatum, advocatias, omnia jura centurionum et villicorum, curtes et villas, quæ regni erant, cum pertinentiis suis, militiam et castra."—*Ibid.*, No. 262; cf. PETR. DIAC., *Chron. Cassin.*, iv. 37.

his part to renounce, in writing, and publicly, on his coronation day, all that he had usurped from the Church (that is, the right of investiture), to declare the churches free, with their tithes, and those of their possessions which did not plainly belong to the empire; finally, to omit nothing by word or deed to secure the patrimony of St. Peter and the personal safety of the pope.[1]

The emperor thus obtained a thousand times more than he could have either asked or hoped for. The vast fiefs[2] of the bishops, which, independently of lands given to the Church, constituted in Germany principalities almost as large as those of the greatest lay vassals, would thus have returned to the royal domain, and the result would have been an enormous increase of power for German royalty, which, joined to the *prestige* of imperial authority with which it would be almost always clothed, would have furnished him the means of an easy triumph over the resistance of secular princes, and a foundation for that absolute monarchy which had been the dream of Henry III. and Henry IV. It was natural, therefore, that such a concession should excite the liveliest opposition, not only among the German bishops, whom it would despoil, but also among the lay princes, whom it would expose to the formidable preponderance of the imperial power. As to the pope, he was only bound to regard the rights and spiritual interests of the Church, which were completely guaranteed. The Church of Germany was to be placed by this arrangement in a position analogous to that of the Churches of France and England, where the bishops, though holders of large

[1] "Ut imperator . . . omne male usurpatum Ecclesiasticum . . . astante clero et populo, per scriptum deponeret . . . Dimitteret ecclesias liberas cum oblationibus et possessionibus suis quas ad regni non pertinere jus, constare potest. . . . Nihil aut faceret aut diceret ut papa pontificatum amittat, nihilque ipse patiatur in vita, vel in membris, vel capiatur mala captione."—PETR. . . . DIAC., *loc. cit.*

[2] *Reichslehne*, fiefs of the empire quite distinct from *Kirchengüter* or Church property.—GERV., i. 40.

domains, and on that account bound to do feudal service, were far from counting among their fiefs territories as vast or cities as important as in the empire, but where, on the other hand, investiture by the crosier and ring no longer existed.[1] By this system the German Church was to preserve its freedom of election, and was to retain absolute possession of the tithes, beside the endowments properly so called, tributes of piety and charity in the form of oblations or donations.[2] Finally, she was to escape from that bondage of temporal interests which turned her aside from her august mission. "In your kingdom," said Pascal in the scheme for a treaty (*in charta conventionis*) which he sent to Henry,[3] "the bishops and abbots are perpetually obliged to attend the courts of justice, and to make war; the ministers of the altar are become ministers of the court,[4] in conse-

[1] In England, only since the peace made between Henry II. and St. Anselm.

[2] Which were then naturally most frequently territorial, and which would have quickly formed again a vast domain.

[3] *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 263, and COLETTI, *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 993. We translate by *projet de convention* (scheme for a treaty) the terms used by the emperor, *charta conventionis*, although in its actual form it seems to have been completed; but it is evident that it was only intended to come into operation after Henry's coronation, since we read in it, "Porro Ecclesias . . . liberas decernimus, sicut in die coronationis tuæ omnipotenti Domino in conspectu totius Ecclesiæ *promisisti*." This promise was, as well as the coronation, one of the stipulations of the treaty, and the pope supposed it fulfilled. But Henry was only crowned two months afterwards, and without making any promise of this kind; on the other hand, the pope had already a copy of this letter which he sends to the Parmesans, saying, "Petii ab eo ut sicut in *charta conventionis* ejus scriptum est, mihi adimpleret. Hæc est charta conventionis ejus ad me." The text which we quote follows. Cf. *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 261, 262, and 263. Fleury is mistaken in referring this letter of the pope to the Lateran Council of 1112. St. Marc, *Hist. d'Italie*, iv. 982, has already noticed this strange error.

[4] "Ministri altaris ministri curiæ facti sunt. . . . Nunc et mos Ecclesiæ intolerabilis inolevit ut electi episcopi ac . . . oportet episcopos juris sæcularibus expeditos, curam suorum agere populorum nec Ecclesiis suis abesse diutius, . . . tanquam rationem reddituri pro animabus eorum." —*Cod. Udalr.*, No. 263.

quence of having accepted cities (duchies and all which belongs to the service of the kingdom) from the hands of kings; and thus has arisen this intolerable custom that bishops-elect can only be consecrated after they have been invested by the royal hand: hence simony, and the violent usurpation of dioceses. This is why our predecessors of happy memory, Gregory VII. and Urban II., have in council constantly condemned lay investiture, and deposed and excommunicated those who received it. It is needful then that bishops, being freed from temporal burdens, should care only for their people and keep to their churches. They must watch, according to the apostle Paul, that they may render account of all the souls committed to them."

If we believe a not very trustworthy account, the imperial plenipotentiaries,[1] all, except the Chancellor Albert,[2] laymen, as were also those of the pope,[3] contented themselves with offering some objections to Pascal's plan, declaring that the king would neither do violence to the Church, nor incur the guilt of sacrilege by despoiling her.[4] But it is certain that they accepted the treaty, knowing perfectly, as their master afterwards declared,[5] that it was impossible to be executed. They did not hesitate to affirm that their king, in return for the concessions offered by the pope, would renounce investiture,[6] and these preliminaries were confirmed

[1] We do not hesitate to describe thus Henry's letter to the Parmesans, written to justify the Pope's captivity, and showing contradictions and bad faith in every line. No other contemporary source mentions these objections.

[2] Their names are found at the head of the oath quoted by the *Acta Sutrina*, ap. BARON., ad ann. 1111, and *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 262.

[3] The fact of the papal plenipotentiaries being laymen is remarked in a letter from Cardinal John of Tusculum to the Bishop of Albano, ap. BARON., b. iv. c. 13.

[4] "Cum nostri responderent: Nos quidem nolle Ecclesiis violentiam inferre, nec ista subtrahendo tot sacrilegia incurrere."—*Cod. Udalr.*, No. 261.

[5] "Nostris tunc idem firmantibus, si hæc uti præmissum est, complesset (papa) *quod tamen nullo modo posse fieri sciebant*."—Letter of Henry V. himself to the Parmesans, *Cod. Udalr.*, 261.

[6] "Me quoque investituras Ecclesiarum, uti quærebat, refutaturum." —*Ibid*,

by the reciprocal oath of the negotiators on both sides made in the portico of St. Peter's, February 5, 1111. Henry's ambassadors carried the treaty to him at Sutri, and he accepted it without hesitation, conditionally on its authentic and solemn confirmation by the ecclesiastic and secular princes.[1] He also swore to accept all the conditions of the treaty,[2] and to protect the pope's life against any violence or imprisonment.[3]

Frederic, Duke of Suabia, the Chancellor Albert, Count Herman of Saxony, and nine other nobles, all counts or margraves, thus guaranteed by oath the pope's personal security.[4] They also exchanged hostages, to be retained until the entire accomplishment of the treaty. Frederic, the emperor's nephew, with four other nobles, was sent to

[1] That is, probably, of a diet at which all the princes and bishops who had not accompanied him should be assembled. "Præbuit rex assensum, sed eo pacto quatenus hæc transmutatio firma et autentica ratione, consilio quoque vel concordia totius Ecclesiæ ac regni principum assensu stabiliretur."—*Chron. Urspergensis*, ann. 1111. It is evident that he could not settle a matter so important to the constitution of the empire without the assent of all those interested.

[2] "Hæc ita jurejurando firmavit imperator."—*Chron. Cassin.*, iv. 37.

[3] "Post hæc misit papæ nuntios Sutrium coram quibus rex juravit in hæc verba. Juramentum Henrici, &c.: Ego, Henricus rex, ab hac hora in antea non ero in facto aut consilio, ut dominus Paschalis papa II. perdat papatum, vel vitam, vel membra, aut capiatur mala captione, vel per me, vel per submissam personam. . . . Sic observabo domino papæ sine fraude et malo ingenio, si D. papa proxime die Dominica sic adimpleverit mihi, sicut in conventionis chartula scriptum est."—*Acta Sutr.* ap. BARON., ann. 1111.

[4] "Qui jurabant papæ securitatem de vita, de membris, de papatu, de captione. . . . Hi omnes post imperatorem eo ordine jurarunt, ut si imperator hæc implere nollet, ipsi cum omnibus suis cum Romano Ecclesia tenerent. . . . Actum Sutrii in burgo, quinto Idus Februarii."—*Ibid.* The Pope might believe himself secured by three oaths: 1st, that of the Chancellor and four counts who had treated with Peter, son of Leo, at Rome; 2nd, that of the king; 3rd, that of the ten nobles and the Chancellor, who swore to put themselves at the disposal of the Roman Church if "Rex juramentum hoc et ea quæ in charta conventionis scripta sunt non observaverit." These two last oaths were taken at Sutri, Thursday, February 9th.

the pope; the king chose Peter, son of Leo, and his family. Pascal then wrote to Henry in the most affectionate terms to excuse himself, because the severity of the season would not permit him to meet his guest.[1]

The king, seized with a very unexpected access of filial piety, demanded ecclesiastical burial for his excommunicated father; but the pope replied by a peremptory refusal, expressed thus: "The martyrs of God, who are in celestial glory, command us, under terrible penalties, to cast the bodies of criminals out of their churches, for we cannot have communion in death with those who are deprived of it in life."[2]

This refusal did not stop Henry's advance. Having arrived on Saturday, February 11th, close to the gates of Rome, at a place whence the basilica of St. Peter's could be seen, he there renewed his oath to renounce investitures, to watch over the pope's security and liberty, and to guarantee his possession of the patrimony of St. Peter, Apulia, Capua, Sicily, and Calabria—in a word, all the provinces occupied by the Normans.[3] The next day, Quinquagesima Sunday, the 12th of February, Henry, as had been agreed upon, entered the city, where he was received with the most triumphal pomp; and having met the pope at the steps of St. Peter's,[4] he prostrated himself before him, kissed his

[1] *Chron. Cassin.*, iv. 38.

[2] "Ipsos enim Dei martyres jam in cœlestibus positos id terribiliter jussisse, scilicet ut sceleratorum cadavera de suis basilicis ejicerentur."—*Chron. Cassin.*

[3] "Cæsar, obsidibus datis vicissimque receptis, jurejurando firmavit de Apostolici ipsius vita, de honore, de membris, de mala captione, de regalibus et patrimoniis B. Petri, et nominatim de Apulia, Calabria, et Sicilia, Capuanoque principatu."—*Ibid.*, c. 39.

[4] Saxo says that he there renewed his oath a third time. "In porticu vero manu propria imperatoris et optimatum triplicatur juramentum" (*loc. cit.*). To abridge, we leave out the curious details of the extraordinary pomp with which Henry was received at Rome (see *Act. Sutr.*, ap. BARON., *loc. cit.*), and the sanguinary combat which took place between his soldiers and the Roman people before he arrives at St. Peter's, which he describes as treason, but makes little account of. "Ego tamen quasi pro levi causa non motus."—Ep. *Henr. ad Parm.*, *loc. cit.*

feet, and served him as a squire when he dismounted;[1] then, after having kissed each other three times on the mouth, the eyes, and the forehead, they advanced together amidst the shouts of the people towards the silver gate. There Henry swore to protect the Roman Church in the character of emperor, and the pope greeted him by that title, embracing him again, while a cardinal read the first prayer out of the service of consecration.[2]

The ceremony thus commenced, the pope and emperor entered the church, and, followed by their double suite, seated themselves in the place called the Porphyry Wheel. The pope then claimed the execution of the reciprocal renunciations stipulated in the convention.[3] But Henry withdrew,[4] with his bishops and princes, to deliberate about them, as if that were the right place and time to discuss a treaty which had been accepted by the emperor three days previously,[5] and guaranteed by the most power-

[1] "Ad cujus vestigia cum rex corruisset, post pedum osculo elevatus est. . . . Stratorii officium exhibuit . . ."—*Chron. Cassin.*, *Act. Sutr.*, *loc. cit.*

[2] "Ibi ex libro professionem imperatoriam faciens, . . . mox super eum orationem primam (sicut in ordine continetur) Lavicanus episcopus dixit."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Instaurari Ecclesiasticum jus, refutationem investituræ et cætera quæ in conventionis (charta) scripta fuerant petiit."—*Ibid.*

[4] "In partem juxta secretarium."—*Act. Sutr.*, ap. BARON., *loc. cit.*

[5] The treaty had been concluded at Rome, February 5th, accepted by the emperor at Sutri, February 9th; these dates are proved by Stentzel, ii. 316. It was now the 12th. Between the 9th and the 12th Henry had had time to obtain the consent of his bishops, or, failing to obtain it, to have warned the pope. As to the lay princes, the Duke of Suabia and other great vassals had guaranteed the hostages of the treaty, which evidently implied their assent. The pope, seeing Henry present himself to be crowned, must have supposed the treaty accepted, and the opposition of the German bishops, only shown at St. Peter's, has all the appearance of a trick arranged beforehand by the emperor to obtain his coronation without a treaty. Gervais thinks that Henry and his Chancellor Albert had endeavoured to conceal from the German bishops the treaty concluded with the pope until the moment when its execution should be demanded, so as to throw upon Pascal all the weight of the prelates' discontent (vol. i. p. 200, No. 1). Raumer acknowledges that Henry

ful princes of the empire. There were among the latter only three Italian bishops, two of whom, Bernard of Parma and Aldo of Placentia, were known for their zeal for the Church.[1] The precise details relative to this fatal conference are not known, but when the Germans left the church, after having been begged by a message from the pope to hasten,[2] a dreadful tumult suddenly broke out.[3] The bishops and abbots[4] bitterly reproached the sovereign pontiff for having issued a heretical decree, which robbed them of their possessions, and which they openly refused to obey. The lay princes added a vehement protest to

certainly had an intention to deceive the pope, but that he can find no proof of any similar intention on the part of Pascal.—*History of the Hohenstaufen*, vol. i. b. ii. c. 2. Lüden, on the contrary, suggests that the pope had desired and hoped for this scene, and that his cunning rivalled that of Henry; it is true that, with the extreme disingenuousness of which that author gives so many proofs, he entirely suppresses in his narrative the important fact of the revolt of the German bishops against the confiscation of their fiefs.—*Geschichte Der deutschen Volks*, vol. ix. b. xx. p. 391. Abbot Suger, whose authority is rather more imposing, both as a contemporary and as . . . (*sic*), does not hesitate to accuse the emperor of bad faith. "Inire callens pacem simulat, querelam investiturarum deponit, multa et hæc et alia pollicetur, et ut Urbem ingrediatur, quia aliter non poterat, blanditur nec fallere summum pontificem et totam Ecclesiam, immo ipsum Regem regum veretur."—See p. 290.

[1] See above, the interview at Châlons. The third was Bensignore de Reggio.

[2] "Cum autem longior se hora protraheret, missis nuntiis pontifex conventionem supradicti tenoris repetiit adimpleri."—*Act. Sutr., loc. cit.*

[3] It appears, however, that the German bishops began by showing the pope due honour. "Tunc episcopi transalpini corruerunt et ad oscula surrexerunt. Sed post paululum," the discussion commenced. Suger sees in it only a feint, "inopinata nequitia ficta litis occasione furor Theutonicus frendens debacchatur" (*loc. cit.*)

[4] "Universis ei in faciem resistentibus et decreto suo plenam hæresim inclamantibus, scilicet episcopis, abbatibus tam suis quam nostris et omnibus Ecclesiæ filiis."—Ep. *Henr. ad Parm.; Cod. Udalr.*, 262. We do not know whom Henry meant to designate by these words *tam suis;* since he afterwards caused to be arrested, at the same time as the pope, the three Lombard bishops, and a crowd of cardinals and priests. It is evident that the Roman clergy did not pronounce against the pope. This is therefore another falsehood.

that of the bishops, for the spoliation of the latter deprived them of numerous domains which they held as sub-fiefs from the bishoprics.[1]

The officers in attendance on the king began by complaining, on their own account, of the injustice of such a treaty: the reply made to them on behalf of the pope was the quotation of those texts, so often invoked by the enemies of the Church, importing that we should render to Cæsar the things that belong to Cæsar, and that he who fights for God should not mingle in worldly affairs.[2] The better to explain his motives, Pascal wished to read the diploma, or, if that name is preferred, the bull, which he had addressed to Henry, and which contained all the stipulations of the treaty;[3] but Henry interrupted him, swearing by God and St. Peter that he would always refuse to withdraw from the bishops and abbots the grants made to them by his predecessors.[4] He read and signed this new oath, which destroyed the very basis of the convention,[5] and then summoned the pontiff to sign a treaty

1 "Tumultuantibus in infinitum principibus, pro ecclesiarum spoliatione et per hæc beneficiorum spoliatione."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ad ann. 1111. We translate from the version of Stentzel (i. p. 638, No. 33), but are not certain that the term *principibus* will apply to others than the bishops. Henry does not speak of the secular princes in his letter to the Parmesans, and most of them had, as we have said, already guaranteed the treaty.

2 "Familiares regis dolos suos paulatim aperire cœperunt, dicentes. . . . Quibus Evangelica et Apostolica auctoritas objiceretur, scilicet quia *reddenda sunt Cæsari*, &c., . . . et *nemo militans Deo*," &c.—*Acta Sutrin.*, ap. BARON., *loc. cit.* We think that Fleury, who passes lightly over this crisis so important for the Church, had been mistaken in putting these objections into the mouth of Henry's friends.—*Hist. eccles.*, b. lxvi. No. 3.

3 "Hoc, si salva pace Ecclesiæ dici potest, privilegium proferre voluit. . . . Hæc est charta conventionis ejus ad me."—Ep. *Henr. ad Parm.*, *loc. cit.*

4 "Affirmo Deo et S. Petro . . . ego peccator pro timore terribilis judicii ullo modo subtrahere recuso."—*Ibid.*

5 "In cunctorum astantium oculis et auribus . . . hoc decreto a me lecto et subscripto."—*Ibid.*

which, in all that referred to the coronation, was founded upon it.[1] At that moment, one of the courtiers who accompanied Henry rose and cried: "What is the use of so much talking? Know, pope, that our lord the emperor intends to receive the imperial crown as Charles, Louis, and Pepin received it before him."[2] Pascal refused to give it thus; but Henry, following the advice of the Chancellor Albert and Bishop Burckhard of Münster, caused his soldiers to advance, and, in defiance of his solemn oaths,[3] gave up to them the person of the pope, and those of all his friends and servants. The day was already far advanced, and evening approached; the cardinals therefore advised the pope to crown Henry at once, and put off the discussion of disputed points till to-morrow.[4] But the Germans opposed this. It was with difficulty that mass was said. It was Quinquagesima Sunday; and in the Gospel for the day it was read how Jesus warned His disciples that He should be given up, mocked, scourged, spit upon, and crucified, but that on the third day He would rise again.[5]

[1] "Petii ab eo ut, sicut in charta conventionis ejus scriptum est, mihi adimpleret."—Ep. *Henr. ad Parm., loc. cit.* We do not know precisely where to place Peter Diaconus's curious account: "Interea imperator. . . . Volo, inquit, ut discordia quæ inter nos et Stephanum Normannum hactenus fuit, jam finem recipiat (multa enim imperatoris gratia pericula Stephanus . . .); ipse ad hæc pontifex: Dies, inquit, magna ex parte præteriit, officiumque prolixum erit hodie, ideoque si placet, quod vestrum est prius impleatur."—*Chron. Cassin.*, iv. 40.

[2] "Quid tam multis agimus verbis? Scias dominum nostrum imperatorem," &c.—*Ibid.*

[3] The case of *mala captione* had been formally provided against in all the oaths taken by the emperor and his sureties. He had added the clause, "Si dominus papa proxima die Dominica sic adimpleverit mihi, sicut in conventionis chartula scriptum est;" but it is evident that the pope only asked to fulfil the agreement, and could not be responsible for the refusal of the German prelates to adhere to it.

[4] "Illi id quoque adversati sunt."—*Act. Sutr., loc. cit.*

[5] "Eadem die Dominico quo legebatur Evangelium: Assumpsit Jesus duodecim. . . . Hæc sicut in Christo et in ejus Vicario sunt impleta usque adhuc."—*Récit d'un témoin oculaire*, in MS. Vatic., ap. BARON., ad ann. 1111, c. 9.

After mass the pontiff was dragged from his throne and seated before the Confessional of St. Peter, where he remained until night, guarded by soldiers.[1] Two Germans only protested against the conduct of their king and countrymen. Conrad, Archbishop of Salzburg,[2] loudly protested, and a favourite of the emperor, Henry, burgrave of Misnia, surnamed Caput, or Cum Capite,[3] was so indignant that he drew his sword and threatened the prince. The archbishop, who was ready to die for the right, and who was horrified at the crime committed against the vicar of God, offered his life for Pascal's.[4] He was not put to death; but he expiated his courage by nine years of persecution and exile.[5] God chose this moment to touch the heart of a man who, later, was to be counted among His greatest servants. Norbert, the emperor's chaplain, and afterwards founder of the Premonstratensian Order, threw himself at the feet of the imprisoned pontiff, demanded absolution from him, and renouncing the world, went to seek refuge in profound solitude.[6] Norbert and Conrad began thus, at the feet of a pope chained before the confessional of the first martyr-pope, that career at the end of which they were each destined to be canonised by a successor of Pascal II.

Night being come, the pope was taken to a house near the church, with the cardinals, a number of the clergy, and

[1] "Ex cathedra descendere compulsus pontifex, deorsum ante Confessionem B. Petri cum fratribus sedit, ibique usque ad noctis tenebras sub armatis militibus est custoditus."—*Récit d'un témoin oculaire*, in MS. Vatic., ap. BARON., ad ann. 1111, c. 9.

[2] He is also called Gebhard.—*Vita S. Gebhardi*, ap. CANIS., *Lect. antiq.*, vol. vi. p. 1240.

[3] Details about him and his later career are found in GERVAIS, vol. i. p. 206, note 4. A contemporary monastic chronicle calls him "*Henricus quidam regiæ tyrannidis capitaneus.*" Lüden calls him a heroic man, vol. ix. p. 478.

[4] "Zelo æquitatis vicem Dei dolens . . . tanquam pro justitia mori optans, jugulum præbuit."—OTTO FRISING., *Chron.*, vii. 14.

[5] He was obliged to hide himself in a cave near Admont, in Styria, where he afterwards founded a famous monastery.

[6] HERIMANN, *De restaur S. Martini Tornac*, in *Spicileg.*, vol. ii. p. 915.

many laymen, who shared his imprisonment.[1] Henry let loose his soldiers against the crowd of men, women, and children, who had come with flowers and palms, many of whom were robbed, beaten, put in chains, and even killed.[2] The Germans pillaged the ornaments and sacred vessels used in the procession.[3] The Roman people, hearing of these indignities, and of the pope's imprisonment, armed themselves, and seized all the Germans they could meet in the city. Next day, still more excited, they went to attack the imperial camp in front of St. Peter's; the emperor was thrown from his horse, and in great danger; Count Otho of Milan was cut to pieces. The fight went on all day. The Romans, at first victorious, and afterwards repulsed, ended by forcing the Germans back into their intrenchments.[4] Two cardinals, Leo, a monk of Monte Cassino, and Bishop of Ostia, and Giovanni, Bishop of Tusculum, succeeded in escaping from the pope's jailers, dressed like men of the lower class.[5] Towards night (Monday, February 13th), Cardinal Giovanni, constituting himself the vicar of the sovereign pontiff,[6] convoked the Romans, and strongly exhorted them to fight for life and liberty, and for the defence and glory of the Holy See ("*pro defensione, pro gloria sedis apostolicæ*"). He made them swear war to the death against the emperor; he wrote to the neighbouring bishops to come to the help of the Holy See, and to have prayers offered everywhere for the *liberty of the pope and of the Church*.[7]

[1] "Capta est cum eo clericorum et laicorum copiosa multitudo."—*Act Sutr., loc. cit.*

[2] "Pueros item, ac diversæ ætatis homines, qui obviam ei cum floribus et palmis exierant, alios obtruncari, alios . . . jussit."—*Act. Sutr., loc. cit.*

[3] *Rudolf. Chron. abb. S. Trudonis*, p. 697, ap. STENTZEL, i. 639; DOMNIZO, ii. 18.

[4] See the details, *Chron. Cassin.*, iv. 41. [5] "Plebeio habitu."—*Ibid.*

[6] "Agens vices domini Paschalis papæ vincti Jesu Christi."—*Epist. ad Rich. Alban.*; PAPYR. MASSE., *in not. ad Ivon. Carnot. Epist.*, ap. BARON., *l.c.*

[7] *Epist. ad Rich. Alban., loc. cit.* We have thought that this letter to Cardinal Richard, Bishop of Albano, was only a circular; but it must be observed that probably Richard was not in his diocese, as he had for a

Informed of these preparations, Henry judged best to evacuate the enclosure of St. Peter's; but he took Pascal with him. At the end of two days the emperor ordered the pope to be stripped of his sacred garments, and gave him in charge to some knights of his suite, who tied his hands, and dragged him with them across the Tiber and the Anio, and into the Sabine country.[1]

The cardinals, bishops, priests, and laymen arrested with the pope, followed him, stripped of their most necessary clothing, and, like their master, bound with cords. Pascal, with six cardinals, was shut up in the Castle of Trabico. All Italians were forbidden to speak to him: he was guarded and served by German nobles.[2]

long time been legate in France; and we find him there immediately after Pascal's release.

[1] This is how M. de St. Marc, a Gallican of the last century, describes the king's conduct: "Henry, prouder and more impetuous even than his father, seeing then, and, I will venture to say, *having a right to see, in the pope and his councillors nothing but seditious subjects who had tricked their sovereign*, ordered the arrest of Pascal, and those of the cardinals who were not able to make a hasty escape. Henry's conduct is justified by *the soundest policy and the most enlightened reason.*"—*Hist. d'Italie*, Paris, 1766, with the royal licence, pp. 891 and 972. Abbot Suger, whose policy was not so enlightened, although when he wrote he was first minister of a King of France, says: "Imperator pessimæ conscientiæ et facinoris facti perterritus cruciatu, urbem quantocius exivit, prædam a Christiano Christianis inauditam, dominum videlicet papam, &c., adducens."—*De. Vit. Lud. Grossi*, p. 290.

[2] "Advocans milites pontificem sacris vestibus exui jussit: quod cum factum esset, vinctum secum pertraxere. . . . Et in Sabinos ad Lucanum pontem iter agentes, ulteriores Romanæ urbis partes aggressi sunt. Trahebantur interea clericorum laicorumque plurimi vincti funibus. Latinorum nullus audebat cum eodem pontifice colloqui."—*Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 42. "Cardinales ipsos turpiter exuens, inhoneste tractavit, et quod dictu nefas est, ipsum etiam dominum papam tam pluviali, quam mitra, cum quæcumque defert insignia apostolatus . . . superbe spoliavit."—SUGER, *loc. cit.* "Clericos vero, archipresbyteros . . . exspoliavit, planatas et thymiamata auferendo; et proprias vestes, ex quibus vestiti erant, minime dimittebat, nec etiam subtalaria atque femoralia eis habere permittebat."—PAND. PISAN., *Vit. Pasc. II.* Can we help recalling the treatment endured, seven hundred years later, by Pius VI., Pius VII., and the *black* cardinals, at Savona and at Fontainebleau?

Meantime Cardinal Giovanni, Bishop of Tusculum, redoubled his efforts to sustain the courage of the Romans, and induce them to take advantage of the emperor's retreat. But without the support of the Church's old auxiliaries, Matilda and the Normans, what could be hoped? Matilda did not move, and the Normans were in no condition to fulfil their obligations as vassals of St. Peter. On hearing of Henry's arrival at the gates of Rome, the pope had written to his valiant allies to engage them to remain steadfast in their fidelity towards the Church.[1] But the son of Robert Guiscard, the Duke of Apulia and Calabria, died before he could receive this letter, which would have made him fly to the aid of his suzerain.[2] To heighten this misfortune, Bohemond Prince of Tarento had also died,[3] and Sicily was in the hands of a minor, the young Roger, son of the Great Count, who was under his mother's tutelage. Without chiefs who could lead them to battle, therefore, the Normans were powerless, and had every reason to fear lest their Italian conquests should escape them. Indeed, the Lombards, whom they had driven from Apulia, looked forward to a speedy revenge.[4] Roger's troops were obliged to intrench themselves in expectation of immediate invasion. Prince Robert of Capua alone was able to send 300 knights to the aid of Rome; but at Jeventino they were met by the Count of Tusculum, a prince whose house had always been hostile to the liberty of the Church, and who, supported by other leaders of the Imperial party, put to rout this handful of faithful servants of the Holy See, and obliged their chief to beg for peace.[5]

[1] "Pontifex hortatorias litteras illico disseminans, Northmannos et Longobardos monebat in Romanæ Ecclesiæ fide ac devotione persistere."—PAND. PISAN., *Vit. Pasc. II.*, c. 38.

[2] 21st February 1111.

[3] 7th March 1111.

[4] "Horum itaque mors, ut Northmannis magnum incussit metum de imperatoris ejusque exercitui, et Longobardis omnibus extulit animos. Verebantur illi ne imperatoris adventu sedibus suis et principatu pellerentur. . . ."—*Chron. Cassin.*, iv. 41.

[5] *Chron Cassin., loc. cit.*

Henry passed Lent at Albano, and cruelly ravaged the environs of Rome, in hopes of intimidating the Romans, whom he also tried to win by offers of money. But they, influenced by the Bishop of Tusculum, would treat only on condition that the pope and cardinals should be set at liberty. The emperor, therefore, caused the pope to be brought back into his camp,[1] and there declared to him solemnly that if the conditions proposed were not accepted, half of the many captives[2] whom he drew after him should be put to death, and the rest mutilated; and that, moreover, the cardinals should suffer the same fate.[3] These threats were useless; Pascal persisted in his refusal, declaring that he would a thousand times rather sacrifice his life than the sacred rights of the Roman Church.[4] Henry had then recourse to other means: he caused the sovereign pontiff to be besieged by incessant solicitations from the German bishops and nobles, who conjured him to treat with the king and show some faith in his promises, so as to obtain peace.[5] The citizens of Rome even obtained leave to come and describe to the pope the sufferings endured by the prisoners, the desolation of the Church, and the imminent danger of schism.[6] Henry himself knelt before his prisoner, and

[1] "Postremo tam suspicionis quam et concordiæ gratia in castro reductus est. Fuit Apostolicus in eodem ergastulo sexaginta et unum dies." —*Chron. Cassin., loc. cit.* Pagi has shown that the pope's captivity lasted but 56 days.—*Crit. in Baron.*, ann. IIII. It is not known how the period was divided between the fortress and the camp.

[2] "Copiosa multitudo; uti supra."

[3] "Cœpit jurejurando firmare, nisi pontifex illi morem gereret, *et ipsum*, et omnes quos habebat in vinculis, partim occisurum, partim amputatis membris quibusque debilitaturum."—*Chron. Cassin., loc. cit.*

[4] "Pontifex vitam ponere quam jura Ecclesiæ malebat."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Regis optimates . . . adeunt, monent, orant. . . . Regis sibi fidelitatem et obedientiam proponunt . . . ut ea quæ pacis et concordiæ sunt." —*Chron. Saxo.*, ann. IIII.

[6] "Hoc per principes, hoc per clericos, hoc per laicos, civesque Romanos sollicite satagebat. . . . Proponebantur pontifici captivorum calamitates qui amissis liberis . . . durioribus compedibus coercebantur. . . ."—*Chron. Cassin., loc. cit.*

begged his forgiveness, swearing to obey him if he would only consent to grant him the enjoyment of the imperial powers enjoyed by his predecessors.[1] The pope replied, "God preserve me from ever consecrating a man stained with so many crimes and with so much innocent blood!"[2] Driven to extremity, Henry again began to threaten, and gave orders that the prisoners should be executed in Pascal's presence,[3] after allowing them to communicate with him, and try to soften his resolution. Then only the unhappy old man, vanquished by the grief and prayers of his children,[4] bursting into tears, cried, "I must endure for the Church's peace and deliverance what I would give my life to avoid."[5]

A treaty was therefore set on foot at Ponte Mammolo, on the banks of the Anio, which divided the Imperialist army from the Roman troops, April 11, 1111. The emperor promised that on the next day or the one following he would liberate the pope, cardinals, and all the captives; that he would restore the part of the Roman Church property which he had taken, and obey the pope, saving the honour of the kingdom and empire, as Catholic emperors were accustomed to obey Catholic popes.[6] Pascal, on his side, swore never to disturb the emperor nor the empire on the subject of investitures of bishoprics or abbeys, to pardon all the

[1] "Rex ipse pedibus ejus humiliter profusus veniam postulat, obedientiam spondet, dummodo," &c.—*Ann. Saxon.*, ann. 1111.

[2] "Absit vero ut homini interfectorum sanguine cruentato, tantisque flagitiis exsecrando consecrationem impertiam!"—*Trithemius*, ap. MABILL., v. 559.

[3] See *ibid.*

[4] "Victus tandem lacrymis atque suspiriis filiorum."—*Chron. Cass., loc. cit.*

[5] "En cogor pro Ecclesiæ pace et liberatione id perpeti quod ne paterer, vitam quoque cum sanguine profundere paratus eram."—*Chronic. Cassinens.* We have tried to harmonise the accounts of these outrages given by Peter Diaconus in his *Chronicle of Monte Cassino*, by the annalist Saxo, and by Trithemius, following the same order as Mabillon.—*Ann. Bened.*, b. 72, c. 2.

[6] "Salvo honore regni et imperii, sicut imperatores catholici pontificibus Romanis solent." This promise was sworn to by four bishops, the Chancellor Albert, seven counts, and the Marquis Wemer. We are astonished to find foremost among them Frederic, Archbishop of Cologne, whose later conduct so loudly contradicted his participation in this deed.

wrongs and outrages which his friends had endured, never to pronounce an anathema against the emperor, and finally to crown him immediately, and to aid him honestly in maintaining his empire in peace.[1] This promise was sworn to by the sixteen cardinals who were prisoners;[2] but Henry was not satisfied; he required that before being set at liberty, and allowed to return to Rome, where the pontifical seal had been left, Pascal should draw up and give to him the bull which was to acknowledge the right of investiture.

On the following day, April 12th, in the field of the Sette Frati, while the camp was being removed, the bull was prepared, and in the evening, when the army had crossed the Tiber, the pontifical seal was brought from Rome by a secretary, who copied the bull, which Pascal immediately signed under the title of *privilege*.[3] It stated that the pope confirmed to the emperor the prerogative granted by his predecessors to those of Henry; that bishops and abbots elected without violence or simony should be invested by the emperor with crosier and ring, and that no bishop elected without the emperor's consent should be consecrated until he had thus been invested.[4] An ana-

[1] "Neque aliquod malum redditum reddet sibi vel alicui personæ pro hac re, et penitus in personam regis nunquam anathema ponet."—WILL. MALM., b. x., ex *Chron. David. Scott. Bancor. epist.* Cf. BARONIUS, ann. 1111, et *Concil.*, ed. COLETTI, vol. xii. p. 1174. The stipulation as to the anathema is not reproduced in the deed of the pontifical oath given by Baronius (*ex Act. Vit. Pasc.*), but may be understood in the general terms, "Non inquietabit regem nec ejus regnum et imperium."

[2] Of whom two were suburban bishops and three deacons.

[3] "Die igitur altero, in eodem campo qui Septem Fratrum dicitur, dum castra moverent, illud dictari oportuit. . . . Jam locatis castris, accitus ex urbe scriniarius, scriptum illud inter tenebras nocturnas exaravit, cui invitus licet pontifex subscripsit, quod sic se habet: Privilegium Paschalis PP. quod fecit," &c. Thus speaks the author of *Acta Sutrina* or *Acta PP. Paschalis*, quoted by Baronius, who was an eyewitness, as he himself says in concluding: "Hæc sicut passi sumus, et oculis nostris vidimus, mera veritate conscripsimus."

[4] "Ut regni tui episcopis et abbatibus libere præter violentiam et simoniam electis, investituram virgæ et annuli conferas. . . . Si quis autem . . . nisi a te investiatur, a nemine consecretur." The text of the

thema was pronounced against whoever should infringe the provisions of this privilege, which was not, indeed, guaranteed or countersigned by any cardinal. Finally, on Thursday, April 13th, Pascal II. and Henry V. entered the Leonine city,[1] and proceeded to St. Peter's, where, while the gates were closed to keep out the people,[2] the pope crowned the emperor, and solemnly gave over to him the privilege of investiture. At the Communion the pope having broken the wafer, gave part of it to the emperor, saying, "Lord Emperor, this body of the Lord which the Catholic Church declares to have been born of the Virgin Mary, and crucified for us, we give to you as a pledge of peace and concord between you and me, between the empire and the priesthood. As this portion is separated from the living body, thus may he who shall violate this treaty be separated from the kingdom of Christ."[3]

Pascal then returned to Rome, where the people received him joyfully. The emperor, after having loaded the pope and clergy with presents, started the same day for the north.[4] He had previously gone to visit the Countess Matilda,[5] whose favour he wished to secure, and at whose

privilege is in BARONIUS, ann. 1111, *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 265; and *Conc.*, xii. 1176.

[1] This name was given in the middle ages to the quarter on the right bank of the Tiber, which contained St. Peter's, and which was then regarded as outside the city of Rome.

[2] "Portes omnibus Romanæ urbis, ne quis civium eo adveniret observatis."—*Chron. Cass.*, *loc. cit.*

[3] This last phrase, only quoted by Peter Diaconus, is not found in the versions of the pope's allocution given by William of Malmesbury, from the work of the Emperor's chaplain, David of Bangor, the *Codex Udalr.*, No. 264, and Papyrus Masson, in his *Notes sur Yves de Chartres*. Lüden (vol. x. b. xx. c. 4, No. 11, p. 636) seems horrified by this communion of two, which he calls profanation. The breaking of the wafer seems to him above all incredible, and authorises him to call the pope "*non pontifex, sed carnifex*." It is evident from these observations that the historian *does not know* that every day in all masses said by Catholic priests this breaking takes place. And it is by *savants* of this kind that the Catholic Church is daily judged and condemned.

[4] *Chron. Urspery.*, *loc. cit.*, 18.

[5] DOMNIZO, ii. 18.

request he had at once released the Bishops of Parma and Reggio, who had been made prisoners with the pope.[1] The two illustrious personages met in the Castle of Bibianello, where they spent three days together,[2] during which they needed no interpreter, as the Countess spoke German perfectly. Henry declared that he had never seen so extraordinary a woman: he gave her the title of Mother, and made her vice-queen of Italy.

Henry then went to Verona, where he kept the feast of Whitsuntide, and renewed the alliance between the empire and the Venetian republic, after which, crossing the Alps, he proceeded to do honour to the memory of the father whom he had dethroned, by giving him the most magnificent obsequies that had ever been known. Using the permission he had obtained from the pope,[3] the emperor caused the body of the excommunicated prince to be interred in the Cathedral of Spires. Immunities were granted to the citizens of that town and of Worms on the occasion, to reward them for their fidelity to the sovereign so cruelly treated by his son, but whose "blessed memory"[4] that son now celebrated. Finally, on the feast of the Assumption he held a diet at Spires, near the glorified tomb of his victim. There, to put a seal on his victory, the prince bestowed the investiture of the archbishopric of Mayence, the first see of the empire, on his chancellor Albert, the man who had been the principal instrument of his violences, of his dishonest dealing, and of his success at Rome in this contest with Pascal II.

[1] "Pergere nec Cæsar sapiens usquam cupiebat
Respicere faciem, nisi dictæ comitissæ."
—DOMNIZO, ii. 18.

[2] From the 3rd to the 6th May 1111.

[3] From the *Chron. Urspery.*, *loc. cit.*, we might believe that he had also obtained this permission from the pope while a prisoner.

[4] "Ob firmam et inviolabilem fidem quam Wormatienses cives patri nostro *beatæ memoriæ* servaverunt et nobis quoque servare debent."—*Ludwig. Reliquiæ* MS., ii. 180, ap. STENTZEL, i. 653. Cf. GERVAIS, i. 49.

CHAPTER XI

VICTORY OF THE TEMPORAL POWER

Bruno, Bishop of Segni, proposes to the pope to break his bull.—Bruno's letter displeases the sovereign pontiff.—The French bishops protest.—Intervention of Geoffrey of Vendôme.—Exasperation of the monks of Hirschau.—Manifesto of the monks who had taken refuge at St. Bénigne of Dijon.—Pascal II. assembles a council at the Lateran.—Humility of the sovereign pontiff.—Pascal's profession of faith before the council.—Sentence of the Lateran fathers.—Hildebert of Mans and Yves of Chartres apologists for Pascal II.—Joceran answers Yves.—Council of Vienne, where the emperor is excommunicated.—The emperor's chicanery enlightens the princes as to the dangers with which they are threatened.—Henry V., becoming more powerful than Henry IV. had ever been, lays aside all caution.—Defection of the Chancellor Albert of Mayence.—Albert is imprisoned in his own fortress of Trifels.—Marriage of Henry V. with Matilda of England at Mayence.—Insurrection against the emperor: victory of the confederates.—Thomas de Marle excommunicated and deprived of knightly honours.—Council held at St. Géréon at Cologne.—Albert set free.—Erlung of Würzburg deserts the emperor.

THE temporal power, then, was victorious, and never did victory appear more complete or more brilliant. In the spectacle of a pope detained a prisoner before the confessional of St. Peter's, dragged with bound hands into a fortress, and thence to the Imperial camp, there to sign a treaty dictated by the emperor, there was more than complete vengeance for the humiliation which that prince claimed to have suffered at Canossa. Conqueror in a contest which had lasted for forty years, Henry, the son of the excommunicated sovereign, returned to rehabilitate his father's memory, and celebrate a double triumph, holding in his hand the authorisation of investitures signed by the very

pontiff who had so often proscribed them. The allies of the pope saw bending before the ascendency of the empire both the power of the Church and the independence of those lay vassals whose swords had so often preserved her. The Normans trembled for themselves in their mountains, and for the first time the great Matilda had shown herself friendly to the German emperor. The successor of Gregory VII. had neither been able to vanquish nor to die, nor even to keep silence. He remained in his city of Rome, deprived alike of allies, of resources, and of glory. But from this excess of abasement the Church was to spring as strong and as free as before, and the spirit of Gregory VII. was destined to show itself more living and more fruitful than ever.

When Gregory had undertaken the government of the Church, it had been necessary for him to create a centre of resistance to lay usurpation; he had been obliged to form and discipline that army which Rome was able to dispose of for a quarter of a century after his death. That army was so powerful, so numerous, and so inflamed by the spirit of the immortal pontiff, that the blamable weakness of a successor was unable to destroy it. All was saved because God directed all.

Pascal II. might have repeated to his imperial jailer the words of Pope Vigilius when imprisoned by the Emperor Justinian and bidden to sign an impious decree: "I warn you that though you may keep me prisoner you cannot keep St. Peter."

The indignation of Catholics first expressed itself by the mouth of a monk and saint from the height of that holy mountain which had been the cradle of the monastic orders. Monte Cassino was then governed by Bruno, a Piedmontese, sprung from one of the noblest families of Asti,[1] whom Urban II. had taken to the Council of Clermont, and Pascal II. had appointed his legate in France.[2] Having

[1] That of Soleri.

[2] See above.

quitted his bishopric to become again a simple monk, Bruno had taken refuge in a cell at Monte Cassino; but Pascal permitted him to remain there only on condition that he should continue to govern his diocese. When he was elected abbot of the great mother abbey, Pascal congratulated him, saying that he was not only worthy to fill that office, but even to occupy his own in the Holy See.[1] Bruno was the first to protest against the treaty signed between the pope and the emperor. In the name of several bishops and cardinals assembled at Monte Cassino, he invited the pope to annul his bull and excommunicate Henry V.[2] This proposal gave rise to a division at Rome. Those who had shared the pope's captivity were resolved that investiture should be condemned as before;[3] but others, on the contrary, became apologists of all that had passed. Bruno, warned that he was being denounced as an encourager of discord and scandal, thought himself obliged to write to the pope as follows: "To Pascal, sovereign pontiff, all that is due to such a lord and father,—Bruno, a sinner, bishop and serf of the blessed Benedict. My enemies say that I do not love you, and that I speak evil of you; but they lie. I love you as my lord and father, and will acknowledge no other while you live. But if I am bound to love you, I am bound to love yet more Him who has created both you and me, and who should be preferred above all others. But this treaty, so shameful, made with such treachery, and so contrary to all true religion, I cannot approve; and neither do you, according to what many have told me. And who, indeed, can defend a treaty which violates our faith, annihilates the freedom of the Church, destroys the priesthood by shutting the only true door by which it can be entered, and opening many others for thieves and robbers? We have

[1] *Chron. Cassin.*, l. iv. c. 31.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] "Hi qui cum illo in vinculis fuerunt, dicebant: Quod ante diximus, dicemus; damnamusque quod ante damnavimus."—*Ibid.*

the canons and constitutions of the holy Fathers from the time of the apostles to yours. We ought to walk in this royal road, and not to turn to the right or to the left. You had established an excellent constitution, identical with that of the apostles, which condemns and excommunicates all who receive investiture from the hands of laymen. This constitution is holy and catholic, and therefore should not be gainsaid. Confirm it again, venerable father! proclaim it before all! Denounce once more that heresy which you have so often prosecuted, and you will soon see the Church reconciled to you, and all hastening to your feet, joyful to obey their father and lord. Have pity on the Church of God! have pity on the spouse of Christ! and restore to her by your prudence that liberty which she seems to have lost by your fault. As to your obligations, as to the oath you have taken, I think nothing of it; and when you have broken it, I shall obey you as much as ever."[1]

Pascal, extremely annoyed by this letter, cried, "If I do not remove him from his monastery, he will remove me from the government of the Church with his arguments."[2] Bruno, by Pascal's nomination, was already Bishop of Segni; but, under present circumstances, the pope determined to forbid him to be at once bishop and abbot, and sent, by Cardinal Leo of Ostia, a monk and librarian of

[1] "Brunus peccator, episcopus, B. Benedicti servus. . . . Inimici mei dicunt quod . . . sed mentiuntur. . . . Fœdus autem illud tam fœdum, tam violentem, cum tanta proditione factum. . . . Apostoli enim omnes (can. Apost., 31) illos damnant et a fidelium communione segregant, quicumque per sæcularem potestatem Ecclesiam obtinent. Laici enim quamvis religiosi, nullam tamen disponendi Ecclesiam habent facultatem. Similiter et constitutio tua, quæ de Apostolico fonte manavit. . . . Miserere Sponsæ Christi, et per tuam prudentiam suam recuperet libertatem, quam modo per te amisisse videtur. Ego autem . . . illud juramentum . . . parvipendo," &c.—BARON., ann. 1111. He wrote at the same time to the cardinal-bishop of Porto, who had signed the treaty, to remind him that those who defended a heresy condemned by the Church became by that very fact heretics and excommunicated persons.

[2] "Nisi illum a monasterii administratione removero, ipse suis argumentis Ecclesiæ mihi regimen tollet."—*Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 44.

Monte Cassino, an order to the monks of the monastery no longer to recognise Bruno, but to choose his successor.[1] The monks replied that they would obey Bruno as long as he would consent to govern them, and refused to accept the successor whom the cardinal-bishop declared should be imposed upon them by force, and even, if necessary, by the aid of armed men. Then Bruno, having assembled them, spoke to them as follows: "Rather than be the cause of a scandalous dissension between you and the holy Father, I return to you the crosier you have confided to me;"[2] and he placed it on the altar and retired to his bishopric.[3] But this retreat did not allay the opposition to Pascal, which was daily increasing. The cardinal-monk of Monte Cassino, Leo, Bishop of Ostia, who had been charged with the expression of the papal indignation against Bruno, joined the cardinal-bishop of Tusculum in invoking an assembly of bishops and cardinals to confirm the old sentences against investiture, and to declare the pope's concessions null and void. The latter, who had withdrawn to Terracina, reproached the prelates for their unruly conduct; but at the same time promised that he would revoke the deed which he had given only in the hope of saving the town and his brethren from certain ruin.[4] The pope fully understood

[1] "Sin autem secus agerent, in omnibus monasterii cellis abbates ipse statueret."—*Chron. Cassin.*, l. iv. c. 44.

[2] "Nolo ut propter me inter vos et Romanum pontificem scandalum oriatur. . . . Accipite virgam quam mihi tradidistis."—*Ibid.*

[3] He died August 24, 1125, and was canonised by Pope Lucius II. in 1182.

[4] "Joanni Tusculano et Leoni Velitrensi, episcopis et cardinalibus in unum congregatis consortium et pacem in Christo. Id quod in personam nostram, imo in patrem vestrum præter ipsum Ecclesiæ judicium atque præsentiam vos egistis, etsi vobis ex zelo Dei visum sit, non tamen, ut mihi videtur, canonico tramite incessistis. . . . Commissum quod . . . fecimus emendare curabimus."—*Reg. Pasch.*, No. 23, in *Conc.*, vol. xii. Baronius and Fleury place this meeting of the cardinals before Bruno's protest, which is evidently a mistake: Pascal's letter to the cardinals reproving their conduct being of July 5th, while the dismissal of Bruno from his functions as Abbot of Monte Cassino, occasioned by his protest,

that true Catholics would not consent to perish with him; he knew that orthodox Italy was addressing to him on all sides words such as those which a contemporary writer places in the mouth of St. Peter: "O Pope Pascal, learn to watch over the liberty of the Church, and to form thy will upon that of the Crucified who died for His Spouse; and who has confided her to thee that thou mightst keep her always worthy of Him. Know how to die, O pontiff, rather than to let her be violated by enemies or seduced by false lovers, for the Lord Christ knows that if thou wilt resist to the utmost, none shall be able to prevail against the liberty of His Church."[1]

In France the indignation of the Catholics broke out with even greater force, and the pope fell in the estimation of the greater number.[2] Bishops Robert of Paris, Gualo of Léon, the new abbot Pons of Cluny, and many other prelates, declared that all the concessions made to the emperor were absolutely null, and that Pascal ought to have died rather than give up justice and the decrees of the Fathers to the secular power.[3] The monk Joceran, Abbot of Ainay, who filled the see of Lyons as successor to the famous Hugh,

must have been in May, since he was elected October 1, 1107, and governed the abbey three years and seven months, according to Peter Diaconus.—*Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 31, 44.

[1] "O pastor rector Paschalis, summe sacerdos . . .
. . . Scelus, aspice, libera caute . . .
Velle tuum firmum super illum stet Crucifixum
Qui semet morti pro Sponsa subdidit hosti . . .
Ferto prius mortem male quam violetur ab hoste:
Nullus eam raptor rapiat tibi, nullus amator
Falsus, seducat blande virtute nec ulla.
Scit Dominus Christus quia si steteris bene firmus,
Libertas Sponsæ nunquam invenietur ab hoste."
—Domnizo, ii. 16.

[2] "Multis postmodum vilior extitit."—Order. Vital., vol. x. p. 762.

[3] "Papam redarguebat . . . quidquid imperatori verbo seu scripto concesserat, irritum esse debere indubitanter censebant. . . . Pro veritate et justitia debuisset optare mori. . . . Vincula et flagra perpeti quam aliquid contra jus et statuta Patrum potestate annuere sæculari."

assembled in council not only his own suffragans, but also the bishops of the neighbouring provinces; so that a report was spread that they would judge and condemn Pascal.[1] A prelate equally eminent for his zeal and his high birth, allied to the King of France, and destined by God to bring about the glorious conclusion of the contest between the priesthood and the empire, Guy of Burgundy, Archbishop of Vienne, wrote to the pope to learn the truth of what had happened, and to understand his future intentions.[2]

Abbot Geoffrey of Vendôme, who had reinstalled Urban II. in the throne of the Lateran, after the expulsion of the anti-pope Guibert,[3] interfered also to reprove the pope for his weakness. Geoffrey was far from having extravagant opinions upon investiture;[4] for it was he who had pronounced the words so often quoted by moderate Catholics: "The Church must be free, but we must take care not to rub the sick man till we bring blood, nor to break the vase in trying to free it from rust."[5] But when he saw the humiliation of the Roman Church, the prelate's zeal knew no bounds. "The Church," he wrote to Pascal, "lives by faith, purity, and freedom, without them she languishes and dies. Faith is her foundation, Chastity her adornment, Liberty her shield. But when, instead of forbidding investiture (which is a heresy, according to the sentence of the Fathers), she authorises it; when she suffers herself to be corrupted by gifts; when she submits to the secular power, she loses at once Faith, Chastity, and Liberty, and seems, not without

[1] See the letter from Yves of Chartres to the archbishop, to which we shall have to return later.

[2] "Quæ cognoscere postulasti hæc sunt."—Ep. *Pascal. ad Guidon.*, ap. BARON., ann. 1112, c. 3.

[3] See above.

[4] See his explanation of the different kinds of investitures, and those which he considered lawful, in *Opusc.* iv., *ed. Sirmond.*, or in *Not. Jureti ad Yvon.*, *Carnot.*, p. 197.

[5] "Habeat Ecclesia suam libertatem, sed summopere caveat, nedum nimis emunxerit, alliciat sanguinem, et dum rubiginem de vase conatur eradere, vel ipsum frangatur."—*Opusc. ap. Sirmond.*, b. iii. p. 889.

reason, to be no longer living, but dead.[1] . . . He who, seated on the throne of the martyred Apostles, has reversed their glorious destiny,—he, since he has acted unlike them, ought to undo what he has done, and, like another Peter, repent with tears. If he has yielded for fear of death, he should apply his mind to repairing this weakness of the body, which, whether it will or no, must die, and over which he might triumph by winning a glorious immortality. If it was rather because he feared death for his children that he consented to that which Christ, St. Peter, and the canons reject, his fault is not the less, for, instead of saving his children, he has put an obstacle in the way of their salvation. The saints have never taught us to shield from death those who, destined to suffer it sooner or later, might enter at once upon that eternal life which God has prepared for them to the profit of the universal Church. Rather, if they should prove cowardly enough to draw back from the gate of Paradise by renouncing the truth, it was thy duty to sustain them by exhortation and example, being thyself the first to die for the good cause. And as thy fault is inexcusable, as to try to excuse it would be but to aggravate it, nothing remains but to expiate it without delay; through such expiation only, the Church, which now seems ready to breathe her last, may hope to survive. A shepherd whose morals are bad can be endured, but not one who goes astray in matters of doctrine. Against him, the lowest of believers, even an open and infamous sinner, has the right to rebel. And since we perceive the Lucifer of our days to be fallen from heaven, we must not, by any means, conceal from him his impiety, lest, which God forbid! we should ourselves fall with him into the pit of despair. If I have said less than I ought, may my ignorance be forgiven; if more, let me be pardoned for the sake of my hatred of iniquity, and my love of righteousness." [2]

[1] "Fide, castitate ac libertate vivit ac viget Ecclesia. . . . Quæ vitam non habet, nec immerito mortua creditur. . . ."

[2] "Et quia Luciferum nostris temporibus a cœlo lapsum indubitanter

Thus spoke Geoffrey to the monk of Cluny who occupied the place of Gregory VII.

In Germany there were monks whose anger even surpassed that of Geoffrey of Vendôme. The monks of Hirschau, if we may believe the accusations brought against them to Henry V. by their rivals at Lorsch, asserted, that not only ought the emperor to be deposed and excommunicated, but the pope also.[1] All monks had protested against the imperial triumph sanctioned by the episcopate. Gerard, Bishop of Constance, who, as legate, had so long guided Catholic resistance in Germany, had died before the emperor's journey to Rome. The Archbishop of Salzburg, the only one of the German prelates who had protested at Rome against the imperial violence, had been obliged to hide himself in a cave in the mountains of his diocese.[2] Henry had sent to every church in the empire a copy of the privilege extorted from Pascal, with orders to obey it faithfully.[3] Richard, the usurping bishop of Verdun, excommunicated at the Council of Troyes, in 1107, did not fail to carry this instrument in triumph to the abbey of St. Vannes, which was the principal centre of the Catholic spirit of Lorraine. Having assembled the monks, the bishop read to them the papal concession, and then said, "See the end of your tribulations, and exiles, and all that you have chosen to suffer for more than thirty years; see how they have all fallen into the mud!"[4] Upon which

agnoscimus, non ei qualibet occasione illam impietatem dissimulantes, inhæreamus, ne in puteum desperationis cum eo, quod Deus abnuat! corruamus. Si minus dixi quam debui . . .; si amplius, quia de odio iniquitatis et æquitatis a more processi, ignoscatur."—GOFF. VIND., b. i. ep. 7.

[1] "Decani et conventualium principales abbatiæ Laurishamensis libellus supplex ad Henr. V. imper. contra monachos de Hirsaugia in *Goldast.*" —*Apolog.*, i. p. 223. Stentzel also quotes as an authority *Chron. Laurishamense*, p. 224, in *Cod. Laurish. diplom.*, vol. i.

[2] See above.

[3] "Per omne regnum omnibus suis misit ac transcribi et teneri jussit." —*Hist. episc. Virdun.*, in *Spicil.*, b. ii. p. 248.

[4] "Ecce quo tribulationes vestræ, quo exilia vestra quæ per annos

those who accompanied the bishop began to hold forth upon the extent of the imperial power, and to maintain that the king was also the pontiff, who had perfect right to create or to depose bishops.[1] The monks, seeing that the citadel of the Roman faith had capitulated, blushed with shame, and remained silent.[2] But soon after, encouraged by news of the resistance offered by the Archbishop of Vienne,[3] and other prelates out of Germany, to the emperor, they also protested, and although alone of their party in that province, they refused to communicate with imperialists.

The usurping bishop and his canons, according to the custom of the schismatics, proceeded to use violent measures against the monks. The laymen, whom devotion drew to their company, were publicly flogged; monks were beaten, insulted, robbed, deprived of their library, disturbed in their service. The rich members of the chapter treated them as rustics, herdsmen, and beggarly foreigners, whom poverty had united.[4] The good monks once more took the way into exile already familiar to them. Led by their abbot Laurentius, they again sought an asylum at St. Bénigne, at Dijon, formerly opened to them by the holy and zealous Jarenton,[5] and where they found the monks of St. Hubert just arrived, exiled, like themselves, by the violence of a schismatic bishop.[6] This was the last service which Jaren-

triginta plus minusve passi estis, ecce omnia in cœnum devoluta sunt." —*Hist. episc. Virdun.*, in *Spicil.*, b. ii. p. 248.

[1] "Quid referam quosdam comites ejus . . . grandia de rege disputasse, eum regem pariter et summum sacerdotem (quod nec apud ullos hæreticos dictum invenitur), ejus juris esse ut præsules faciat vel deponet dialecticasse."—*Ibid.*

[2] "Conventus erubuit, ingemuit, et quia turris Romanæ fidei cesserat, nullus eorum fuit qui aperiret os."—*Ibid.*

[3] Vienne and Dauphiné then formed part of the empire.

[4] "Fratres nostros non monachos, sed rusticos, gardones, pantonarios et advenas penuria congregatos vocabatis."—Ep. *Laurent. abb. S. Viton., ad can. Virdun.*, in MABILL., *Ann.*, vol. v., append. No. 80, where curious details of this persecution may be found.

[5] In 1085.

[6] See above, c. 14.

ton, the model of abbots, was to render to the cause of the Church, and to the doctrines of which Gregory VII. had constituted him the apostle.[1] From the shelter of this blessed refuge the fugitive monks addressed to their persecutors a manifesto, which paints in lively colours both their sadness and their unshaken faith. "These are the traditions of the Fathers, for which we will live and die: to keep, first of all, the Catholic faith; to adorn it with good works; to obey the Apostolic See as the mother of all the Churches; to abstain from all relations with the excommunicated; to distribute ecclesiastical dignities without simony; to forbid priests to defile themselves by marriage; and to defend the Church, our mother, from all lay servitude." [2]

At the furthest extremity of the Catholic world, in the new kingdom of Jerusalem, there was a German noble, Conon, Count of Urach,[3] who, after having founded the Abbey of Arrouaise,[4] had become cardinal-bishop of Palestrina, and the pope's legate in the Holy Land. At the news of the crimes committed against the Holy See and the liberty of the Church, he convoked a council, and was the first to fulminate the sentence of excommunication

[1] He died February 10, 1112; and the monks of Verdun had left after the festival of St. Vanne, November 9, 1111.

[2] "Ut libera mater Ecclesia sub nulla servitute laica ancilletur, . . . ut nulla se succubarum pollutione commaculent," &c.—Ep. *Laur. loc. cit.* This letter, which is one of the most eloquent monuments of the Catholic spirit of that epoch, commences thus: "Frater L. Catholicus, Domino miserante abbas, Deo disponente abbatia pulsus, homine persequente, clericatis Virdunensibus quod merentur." Abbot Hugh of Flavigny, known by the chronicle which bears his name, was named Abbot of St. Vanne by Richard, and accepted the appointment, for which he was excommunicated by Jarenton. As to the intruder Richard, he repented after three years, and died in Italy, begging the pope to forgive his faults.

[3] This nobleman was son of Eginon, Count of Urach, in Würtemberg, and related by his grandmother to St. Leo IX.—*Hist. litter. de France*, vol. xiii. p. 30, NEUGART, *cod. dipl.* ALEMANN. ii., No. 834.

[4] This house, founded in 1090 by the B. Heldemar and Conon, finally became the headquarters of a celebrated congregation of regular canons.

against the emperor.[1] And it was thus, says the most illustrious historian of the papacy, that in the great shipwreck of the Roman Church, God permitted the failing strength of the head to be compensated by the union and vigour of the members.[2]

It is remarkable that the protest of Catholicity found an echo in the bosom of the Greek schism. Alexis Commenus, Emperor of Byzantium, sent an embassy to Rome to express the pain he had felt in hearing of the wrong done to the pope, and his captivity, and to congratulate the Romans on their resistance to the German emperor.[3]

Amidst this general revolt of Catholic souls against the sacrilegious action of the emperor, the pope long remained tossed and undecided. At first, he complained to Henry V. of the insults which were addressed to him, not only by those at a distance, but by those who surrounded him, but "being unable," he said, "to obtain any satisfaction from them, he left them to the judgment of God, that he might not bring more serious trouble upon the Church."[4]

[1] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1116; COLETTI, *Conc.*, xii. 1161.

[2] "Summam itaque in tanto naufragio Romanæ Ecclesiæ et sacerdotali constantia Conon sibi gloriam comparavit, laudemque peperit immortalem. Ita, Deo mirabili modo operante, ut quod deficit in capite robur, in cohærentibus membris magis ac magis accreverit ad alligandum perfidum regem in compedibus anathematis, et nobiles ejus in maledictionibus sempiternis." —BARON., *Ann.*, ad ann. 1111.

[3] *Chron. Cassin.*, ix. c. 46. The Romans appointed an embassy of six hundred persons to go out to meet these envoys, and the chief of them are denounced to the Emperor Henry by the Abbot of Farfa in his letter. —Ap. *Cod.* Ep. *Udalr.*, No. 259. We do not know what consequences followed this curious negotiation.

[4] "Quod autem de episcopis conquereris, cor nostrum vehementer angustat. Ex quo enim vobiscum illam, quam nostis, pactionem fecimus, non solum longius positi, sed ipsi etiam qui circa nos sunt cervicem adversum nos erexerunt, et intestinis bellis viscera nostra collacerant, et multo faciem nostram rubore perfundunt. De quibus quia judicium consequi non possimus," &c.—*Cod. Udalr.*, No. 271. This letter is dated October 26th, no year. We think it belongs to 1111 rather than 1112, because, if written in the latter year, it would be later than the disavowal made by Pascal at the Lateran Council, March 1112. On the other hand, the

Rome thus resigned herself to bear the heavy reproaches of the French bishops.[1] But soon the ever-rising wave of Catholic indignation, which threatened to submerge the supreme authority, inspired the representative of that authority with other ideas.[2] The pope signified to the most influential bishops, and especially to Yves of Chartres and Guy of Vienne, that he had only yielded to violence;[3] that being now come to himself, he broke, annulled, and for ever condemned the concessions which had been snatched from him in the imperial camp, and that he maintained, and would always maintain, all the condemnations, and all the decisions pronounced by the apostolic canons, by the councils, and specially by Gregory VII. and Urban II. of happy memory.[4] After which, filled with grief and confusion, the holy Father retired to the desert island of Ponza, where, resuming his monk's frock, he announced his desire to spend the rest of his days.[5]

Nevertheless, as the incessant protests of bishops through-

bishops of whom Henry complained might well be those of the Council of Vienne, which deposed him, September 11, 1116.

[1] "Ille vero reprehensiones sophistarum patientur tolerabat, et assertiones eorum legitimas ac veraces esse allegabat."—ORDER. VITAL., b. x. p. 762. The term *sophist* was then used with a good meaning, as synonymous with *wise, learned.*—PAGI, *Crit.*, in BARON., ann. 1111, No. 7.

[2] "Eo tempore multas a Romana Ecclesia passus est injurias, objicientibus ei," &c.—*Chron. Urspery.*, ann. 1112.

[3] "Quibusdam litteris mihi scripsit se coactum fecisse quod fecit, et adhuc se prohibere quod prohibuit, quamvis quædam nefanda quibusdam nefandis scripta permiserit."—*Yvon.*, Ep. 233. "Quibusdam nostrum scripsit."—*Ejusd.*, Ep. 233.

[4] "Scripta quæ in tentoriis. . . . Ego canonica censura cassa omnino et irrita judico, et sub damnatione perpetua permanere judico, ut nullius unquam auctoritatis sint et nullius bonæ memoriæ. Ea vero quæ . . . præcipue felicis memoriæ Gregorius et Urbanus prohibuerunt, damnaverunt, &c.; . . . ego prohibeo, damno, . . . et me illorum sanctiones servaturum profiteor."—*Reg. Pasch.*, No. 24.

[5] "Renuntians omnibus, ad secreta migravit."—HILDEB. "Ad eremum solitudinis confugit, moramque ibi perpetuam fecisset, si," &c.—SUGER, *De Vit. Lud. Gross.*, c. 9. "Deponere se a papatu promiserat et ad Poncianas insulas religioso habitu exul ire."—*Hist. episc. Engol.*, ap. LABBE, bibl. ii. 249.

out Christendom called for solemn reparation, Pascal felt himself compelled to convoke a general council, which met at the Lateran in the middle of March 1112.[1] The legate Conon, returned from Palestine, had a seat there, together with all the leaders of Catholic resistance,—Cardinal Leo of Ostia; Guy, Archbishop of Vienne;[2] Gerard, Bishop of Angoulême and Legate of Aquitaine; Gualo, Bishop of Léon, who was plenipotentiary for the Archbishops of Vienne and Bourges, and a great number of other prelates. The pope related his misfortunes and the promises extorted from him; then he added: "Although Henry and his friends have in no way kept their oaths,[3] I will keep mine; I will not anathematise the emperor, and I will never disquiet him on the subject of investitures, of which God in His sovereign justice shall be the judge. As to the writing which I have signed by constraint, not to save my life, but simply in view of the Church's necessities, and which was neither counselled nor signed by my brethren,[4] I acknowledge and confess that it was ill done, and I desire, with God's help, to see it amended. I refer for the manner of this amendment to the judgment of my brethren here

[1] On the authority of a letter of Frederic elected to Liege by the chapter of Malines, published in the *Ampliss. Collec.*, vol. i. p. 655, Martène, and after him Coletti, in his *Councils*, vol. xii. p. 1155, have believed in the existence of a council at Capua before that of the Lateran, where the pope first disavowed his treaty with Henry V. We think that if this council had been held, Pascal would have mentioned it in his letter to Yves or Guy of Vienne, and that Frederic has evidently made a confusion between Capua and Rome.

[2] William of Malmesbury says that the Bishop of Léon had his authority, but we find his signature among those of the members of the council.—COLETTI, vol. xii. p. 1116. He also says that Giovanni of Tusculum and Bruno of Segni, although they were at Rome, were not present at the papal deliberations, but that immediately after they approved of the acts of the council.

[3] See *Cod. ep. Udalr.*, Nos. 265 to 270, a series of reproaches addressed by the pope to the emperor.

[4] The pope's oath had been guaranteed by the cardinals; but the writing or privilege which the emperor had caused to be drawn up in his camp had been signed only by the pope. See above.

assembled, so that no hurt may be done by it either to the Church or to my own soul."[1]

Pascal then made known his intention of resigning the pontificate, declaring that he acknowledged himself unworthy, that he would himself pronounce his deposition, and that he left to the Church the right of judging in his place. With these words he took off his mitre and cope.[2] But the council, after reading the papers, refused to accept the holy Father's resignation, and obliged him to resume the insignia of his dignity.[3]

They decided that those bishops to whom God had given most prudence and learning should deliberate carefully upon the part to be taken according to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.[4] While the Fathers were seeking means

[1] "Sicut prave factum cognosco, ita prave factum confiteor, et omnino corrigi, Deo præstante, desidero : cujus correctionis modum fratrum, qui convenerunt consilio judicioque constituo, ne forte per hoc in posterum detrimentum aliquid Ecclesiæ aut animæ meæ præjudicium relinquatur." —*Acta conc.*, ap. COLETTI, b. xii. p. 1164.

[2] "Me quoque pontificem non fore jussa date ;
Peccatis male vestra meis venisse notavi,
Officiis me destitui dignum reputavi :
Me quoque deposui, ne pareatis, ait.
Hæc ait, et mitram rejicit mantumque relinquit ;
Ordinet Ecclesia sine me quidquid placet inquit,
Moreque pontificis judicet ipsa sibi."
—*Godefr. Viterbiensis notar. imper.*, ap. MURAT., b. vii., and COLETTI, *loc. cit.*

This narrative is confirmed by the passage in the letter of Hildebert of Mans, which will be found complete in the *Pièces justificatives :* "Si ce cleri plebisque judicio sic commisit ut ex eorum sententia pendeat, an nova capitula cudat, an vetera destruat, aut quæ constituit roboret, aut temporum ratione sic inconvulsa permaneant, in cathedra commoretur, aut deportetur exsilio."

[3] "Scripta legunt cleri . . . . . .
Copia pontificum non ita, dixit, erit,
. . . . . .
Tolle, pater, mantum, curia tota monet."

[4] Such is the sense taken by Fleury (b. lxvi. c. 12) ; but I doubt whether the text does not rather signify that all the bishops should deliberate : "Tunc enim communi favore laudatum est, ut fratres omnes, qui domum

to excommunicate the emperor without Pascal breaking his oath, Bishop Gerard of Angoulême relieved them from their embarrassment by proposing to condemn not the emperor's person, but the *privilege* which he had extorted from the pope. All approved of this, saying that the Holy Spirit had spoken by his mouth.[1] Next day, therefore, the pontiff, in order to clear himself from the suspicion of heresy, of which all who approved of investitures were accused, made a profession of faith before the whole council, protesting his absolute respect for the Holy Scriptures, the four œcumenical councils, which he venerated as much as the four Gospels, and the decrees of the Roman pontiff, especially those of Popes Gregory VII. and Urban II. of blessed memory.[2] "I approve," added Pascal, "I maintain, I confirm, condemn, reject, interdict, and prohibit respectively, all that these authorities have approved, maintained, confirmed, condemned, rejected, interdicted, and prohibited, and I will always continue to do so."[3] After which, the Bishop of Angoulême, assisted by the Cardinal of Ostia two other cardinals, and the Bishop of St. Pol de Leon,[4] read the sentence decided on after deliberation, which was in these terms: "As to this privilege, which is not a privilege, but a sacrilege extorted from Pope Pascal II. by the violence of Henry and to obtain deliverance for the captives and the Church, we all, assembled with the same

a Deo sapientiæ scientiæque perceperant, maturuis super hoc consilium communi collatione susciperant."—*Acta, loc. cit.* It is only clear that they did deliberate when the pope was not present.

[1] "In qua re nullum remedium a toto concilio inveniri poterat. Gerardus requisitus tandem tale consilium dedit. . . . Omne concilium laudans dixit: Non tu locutus es, sed Spiritus sanctus ore tuo."—*Hist. Pontif. Engol.*, c. 35, ap. LABBE, *loc. cit.*

[2] FLEURY, *loc. cit.*

[3] "Et præcipue domini mei papæ Gregorii . . . quæ ipsi laudaverunt, laudo; quæ ipsi tenuerunt, teneo . . . et per omnia et in his semper perseverabo."—*Act. conc., loc. cit.*

[4] These were perhaps the members of the commission chosen to prepare the decree.

Lord Pope in this holy council by ecclesiastical authority and the judgment of the Holy Spirit, declare that we condemn it, we hold it of no value, we absolutely dissolve it, and we forbid, under pain of excommunication, that it be allowed any force or authority."[1] All the council confirmed this act with shouts of "Amen! amen! so be it!"[2] This great decision was subscribed and approved by one hundred and twenty-six bishops and cardinals who composed the assembly, without counting many abbots, clerks, and laymen.[3] At the same time the Church of Milan protested against imperial interference, by deposing Archbishop Grossolanus, and electing in his place the deacon Jordanus, whose title was confirmed by the pope,[4] in spite of strong resistance from the emperor's party.[5] The latter's principal agents in Italy, the Bishop of Acqui and the Abbot of Farfa, wrote to tell him of what was passing in Rome and Lombardy, inviting him to come back immediately before the reaction should extend everywhere.[6] But already Bishop

[1] "Privilegium illud quod non est privilegium, neque vero dici debet privilegium, sed pravilegium . . . judicio Spiritus sancti damnamus et irritum esse judicamus, et ne quid auctoritatis et efficacitatis habeat, penitus excommunicamus."—*Acta conc., loc. cit.*

[2] "Acclamatum est ab universo concilio, Amen! amen! Fiat! fiat!"—*Ibid.*

[3] Among the signatures we observe those of the five suburban bishops, the Patriarch of Venice, thirteen cardinal-priests, and eight cardinal-deacons, two of whom were abbots: "Qui in damnationem consenserunt cum abbatibus aliis et innumerabili multitudine tam clericorum quam laicorum."—*Ibid.* Fleury, by a strange blunder, but misled by a title in the *Collection of Councils* (COLETTI, vol. xii. p. 993), refers to this council the project for a bull drawn up by Pascal at the treaty of Sutri, which we have already quoted in its proper place.

[4] See the details of this election in *Landulph. Jun. Chron.*, c. 23, 25, ap. MURATORI, vol. v.

[5] "Quod ego videns contra imperii vestri honorem fieri omnino interdixi."—Ep. *Anzonis Aquensis* in *cod. Udalr.*, No. 258. The mere superscription of this letter shows the servile spirit of this bishop: "Excellentissimo Domino suo Henrico, &c. A. . . . Majestatis suæ et Aquensis Ecclesiæ servus . . ."

[6] "Vestræ est adhuc Longobardiæ dum terror quem incessistis in corde

Gerard of Angoulême had been charged by the council to notify its decrees to the emperor, and request him to renounce the right of investiture.[1]

The French prelate fulfilled this mission with such zeal and courage in presence of Henry V., that the courtiers, on hearing his speech translated by the Chancellor Albert, were seized with the most violent anger. But the emperor, more generous, loaded the bishop with presents, while the Archbishop of Cologne, who had been Gerard's pupil, and was now his entertainer, showed himself much annoyed. "Master," he cried, "you have brought a great scandal upon our court!" The Bishop of Angoulême replied indignantly, "It may be a scandal to you, but to me it is the Gospel!"[2]

Meantime many French bishops were dissatisfied with the middle course which the council had taken on the proposition of one of their own number. They would have had the emperor excommunicated, and they reproached the pope with weakness. But Pascal found two apologists in the two bishops most distinguished for their learning and eloquence, Hildebert of Mans, and Yves of Chartres. Hildebert's conduct was all the nobler because, having himself been about the same time the victim of a similar crime, he had shown the most heroic constancy. The seneschal of Count Rotrou of Mortagne having seized upon the bishop by means of a cowardly ambush, had kept him for several years chained in

ejus vivit, et facilius potestis cum pugillo aquæ scintillulam ignis extinguere quam flammarum globum cum aquarum abundantia."—Ep. *Anzonis Aquensis* in *cod. Udalr.*, No. 258. Cf. Ep. *Farfensis abbat.*, *cod. Udalr.*, No. 258.

[1] "Quatenus investituras Romanæ Ecclesiæ exponeret."—*Hist. Engol. pontif.*, *loc. cit.* Stentzel thinks we should read *deponeret.*

[2] "'Magister, maximum scandalum generasti in curia nostra.' Indignans auten Gerardus: . . . 'Tibi sit scandalum, mihi est Evangelium.'" —*Ibid.* The degenerate Benedictines who wrote the *Hist. litt. of France* (vol. xi. 602), translate: "Set the scandal before you, the Gospel is for me;" and add, "We must understand *the Gospel commented on by the Decretals.*" They wrote in 1759, under censorship of Louis XV.'s chancellor.

a narrow dungeon.[1] Nothing would have been easier than to obtain his freedom on terms more or less burdensome to his Church; but he would never consent to this, and had written to his clergy as follows: "Pray for me, and pity me, but take no heed of my ransom. Purchased once already by the blood of Christ, there is no need for me to be bought again. His blood is my redemption. How shall I suffer myself to be bought for money for whom a ransom beyond price has been paid? It would be an infamous redemption which would kill the liberty of the Church and bring her into slavery, for all the members must be enslaved when the head is bowed under the yoke of a tribute. I certainly do not value life so much that I should care to redeem its short span. I would rather endanger it, than, for its sake, trample our common liberty under foot. May my death be profitable to the Church, of which, while living, I have been an unprofitable leader. A bishop who cannot live for the general good, should be ready to die for it."[2]

Yves of Chartres made himself, even more openly than Hildebert, the champion and apologist of Pascal II. He refused, in the name of his metropolitan and of all the bishops of his province, to appear at the council which the Archbishop of Lyons had convoked at Anse, and where he supposed they meant to put the head of the Church to open shame, and condemn him whom no mortal had the right to judge.[3] In the memoir which he published to account for

[1] To avenge the imprisonment of the Count of Mortagne at Mans by the Count of Anjou. Hildebert only quitted his prison in 1118.—*Vit. Hild.*, ap. BEAUGENDRE, p. xxxv.

[2] We own ourselves unable to give the laconic force of the original: "Semel Christi redemptus sanguine, iterum redimi non requiro. Sanguis ille redemptio mea. . . . Præterea infamis est redemptio qua libertas perit Ecclesiæ, qua servitus comparatur. . . . Ego certe tanti vitam non facio, ut brevem diligam et redemptam. Malo periclitari de ea quam pro ea communem conculcare libertatem. Prosit Ecclesiæ mea mors, cui dum vivens præfui, non profui. Pontificis est, si non vivere, mori saltem universis."—HILDEB., Ep. iii. 17.

[3] "Potius pudenda patris nostri nudabitis. . . . Concilia in quibus non

this refusal, Yves justified the pope for not having used against the German king all the severity he deserved in consideration of the dangers this severity would have entailed. Supporting his argument by a text of St. Augustine,[1] he maintained that anathema ought only to be employed when there is no danger of schism, and when the criminal has not for accomplices a great number of Christians.[2] He even went so far as to praise Pascal for having made concessions to the king contrary to the ancient decrees and to his own conscience, for the purpose of avoiding, at their expense, the massacre of his people and other great misfortunes, so imitating the indulgence of our Lord.[3] Finally, he argued against those who treated investiture as *heresy*, declaring that in his opinion investiture by laymen was a sacrilegious usurpation, which it was necessary for the liberty and honour of the Church to do away with absolutely, if that were possible without disturbing the peace, but against which, in the meantime, protests should be made with discretion, lest they should give birth to a schism.[4]

The monk Joceran, Archbishop of Lyons, replied to the prelate. "What a new and curious philosophy is this," he said, "to exhort Christians to be timid in presence of the strong; to preach pusillanimity in war and audacity in peace; security in the midst of dangers, and prudence when

possumus eas personas, contra quas agitur, condemnare vel judicare: quia nec nostro, nec ullius hominum probantur subjicere judicio." Further on he says: "Principales Ecclesiæ claves nolumus potestate sua privare, quæcumque persona vices Petri habeat, nisi manifeste ab Evangelica veritate discedat."—YVON., Ep. 236.

[1] *Contra Parmenian.*, b. iii. c. 2.

[2] "Cum congregatione Ecclesiæ multitudo ab eo crimine, quod anathematizetur, aliena est."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Unde nunc excessum ejus non tantum non accusamus, sed dictante ratione approbamus, si imminente strage populi."—YVO., *loc. cit.*

[4] "Manualis illa investitura per laicos facta, alieni juris est perversio, sacrilega præsumptio, quæ pro libertate Ecclesiæ et potestate, salvo pacis vinculo, si fieri potest, funditus absciscenda est. . . ."—*Ibid.* Yves wrote several other letters on the necessity of temporising with the pope, and using charity and moderation towards the emperor.

there is nothing to fear! What a detestable pilot must he be who uses all the resources of his skill in a calm, and leaves the helm the moment the storm arises![1] You remind us of the dangers of the time, the multitude and strength of our adversaries, the weakness and small numbers of our friends; but the more perilous the times are, the more should God's servants strive to keep alive the fire of love in the hearts of the small number of disciples to whom Christ has said, 'Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world!' If you teach faithlessness you proclaim the victory of the world, and destroy the victory of Christ.[2] . . . In endeavouring to withdraw kings and emperors from the jurisdiction of bishops, are you not opposing the decision of the great Emperor Constantine, who acknowledged their authority at the Council of Nicæa? Do you pretend to condemn Ambrose, who excommunicated Theodosius—or Gregory VII., who condemned the Emperor of Germany?"

The archbishop defended himself against the charge of having intended to judge the pope.[3] He allowed, with Yves, that the act of investiture is not in itself heretical, but that there is undoubted heresy in maintaining and approving the custom.[4] Joceran ended by inviting Yves to continue the discussion, but the Bishop of Chartres preferred to keep silence.[5] It is uncertain whether the Council of Anse was ever held; but Guy, Archbishop-legate of

[1] "Novum et inauditum philosophandi genus, hortari contra fortes timidos . . . fieri in bello fugaces, in pace vero audaces. Detestabilis magister navis qui in tranquilla serenitate artis suæ fastigium exercet."—Ap. Ep. YVON., No. 237.

[2] "Si ergo doces diffidendum, victoriam mundi prædicas et Christi victoriam prosternis."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Timuisti certe ubi non erat timor."

[4] "Et licet exteriores investituras per laicos factas non satis propriæ hæresis nomine censeamus; sentire tamen ac defendere, fieri debere, et indubitata hæresis est."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Hæc rescripsimus adversus quæ si quid parare volueris sive cominus sive eminus, audire et respondere parati sumus." Baronius remarks that Yves has preserved this memorable answer in his collection.

Vienne, provided with the pope's instructions,[1] and formally supported by King Louis of France,[2] convoked in council at Vienne, September 15, 1112, all the prelates of Burgundy, Arles, and several other provinces. Two holy bishops distinguished among them were Godfrey of Amiens, formerly Abbot of Nogent, to whom the legate yielded the presidency of the council,[3] and Hugh of Grenoble, whom Gregory VII. had obliged to quit his monastic life and enter the episcopate. The last named, though famous for his gentleness and charity, was the most ardent of all in demanding the emperor's excommunication.[4] The Fathers of the council yielded to his entreaties, and having, says Suger, bound the tyrant with the cords of the anathema, they pierced him with the sword of St. Peter.[5] Henry, however, had sent ambassadors to them with letters from the pope which warmly expressed a desire for peace and union, and which he audaciously affirmed had been forwarded to him since the last council of Rome. But the Fathers attached no importance to them;[6] and being convinced that the pope's declarations to the legates Guy and Gerard deserved all respect when they affirmed that lay investiture was heretical, and that the document extorted by the king from the simplicity of the sovereign pontiff was void,[7] they solemnly and unanimously pronounced the sentence of anathema against

[1] "Sanctæ Paternitatis vestræ mandata sequentes."—*Litt. synod. ad Pasch. pap.* ap. *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1184.

[2] "Domini Ludovici suffragio et concilio."—SUGER, *De vit. Ludov.*, vi. c. 9.

[3] On account of a difficulty which he had in speaking: "quod impeditioris fuerit linguæ."—*Hist. Vit. S. Godfr. Ambian.*, iii. 7.

[4] "Ipse sine cunctis ut Henricus qui sic enormiter in Paschalem peccasset, excommunicaretur . . . effecit."—GUIG. CARTH., *De Vit. S. Hug.*, c. v.

[5] "Imperatorem tyrannum anathemate innodantes mucrone B. Petri perfoderunt."—SUGER, *loc. cit.*

[6] "Litteras bullatas . . . audacter prætendentes . . . super his multa nobis admiratio incuteretur."—*Litt. synod. ad Pasch. pap., loc. cit.*

[7] "Scriptum illud quod rex a vestra simplicitate extorsit damnavimus."—*Ibid.*

Henry in the following words:[1] "As it is certain that Henry, King of the Germans, having come to Rome to sign a treaty of peace, and having sworn to Pope Pascal to secure his life, person, and liberty, and to renounce investiture, fulfilled none of these solemn engagements, but, on the contrary, having kissed the feet, mouth, and face of the sovereign pontiff, the aforesaid king seized, by treason, perjury, and sacrilege, like another Judas, on the person of the sovereign pontiff, seated on his apostolic throne, in presence of the body of the blessed Peter, together with the cardinals, bishops, and many noble Romans; as it is certain that the aforesaid pontiff was dragged into the imperial camp, where he was despoiled of his apostolic insignia, and made a prey to all sorts of indignity and derision, and that King Henry extorted from him by violence an abominable document, we excommunicate the said king, we anathematise him, we separate him from the bosom of our holy mother Church, until, renouncing all he has done, he shall make full satisfaction."[2]

The Fathers immediately demanded from Pascal the public confirmation of their decrees, so that they might be communicated to their brethren,[3] and they concluded with the following request: "As the great majority of nobles, and nearly all the people of the country, think as we do on this matter, we pray you to enjoin upon them, for the remission of their sins, that they should, in case of need, give their support to us and to their fatherland,[4] representing to you, with all due respect, that if you confirm our decree —if, in future, you abstain from all correspondence, inter-

[1] "In ipsum regem nominatim et solemniter et unanimiter sententiam anathematis injecimus."—*Litt. synod. ad Pasch. pap., loc. cit.*

[2] "Post dato sacramento vitæ, membrorum nullæ captionis, refutationis investiturarum . . . post osculationem pedis, oris, faciei, proditione, perjurio et sacrilegio velut alter Judas . . . excommunicamus, anathematizamus, et a gremio S. matris Ecclesiæ sequestramus."—*Conc.*, b. xii. p. 1183.

[3] "Per apertas nobis litteras significare dignemini, quas . . . alter alteri destinare possimus."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Ut, si necesse fuerit, auxilium nobis et patriæ unanimiter ferant."—*Ibid.*

course, or exchange of gifts with the cruel tyrant or his emissaries—we will all be, as we ought, your sons and faithful subjects. But if, contrary to our hopes, you see fit to follow a different course, and refuse your confirmation, we will pray God to come to our help, for you will have rejected us from subjection and obedience to you."[1]

A month later,[2] Pascal solemnly confirmed all the acts of the council, giving God thanks, but not mentioning the emperor.[3] Henry seemed at first to trouble himself very little about these energetic proceedings of the Holy See, and appealing to the authority of the councils, he occupied several years in different expeditions, not brilliantly successful, against Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia. But as his policy was developed, a considerable resistance began to show itself. Long before his expedition to Rome, the German princes had perceived, with surprise and indignation, that the emperor, like his father and grandfather, dreamed of changing into an absolute monarchy that imperial power

[1] "Si vero, quod minime credimus, aliam viam aggredi cœperitis et . . . propitius sit nobis Deus quia nos a vestra subjectione et obedientia repelletis."—*Conc., loc. cit.*

[2] Diploma given at the Lateran, Nov. 20, 1112.—*Conc.*, vol. xii. 1186.

[3] "Unde Deo gratias referimus et quæ statuta sunt ibi rata suscipimus et confirmamus et, cooperante Domino Deo nostra, illibata permanere censemus."—*Ibid.* Baronius, who had not seen this deed, thought that Pascal deferred his confirmation till 1116. He blames the pope severely in these words: "Sic papa Paschalis . . . apostolicæ constantiæ succisis nervis, visus est languescere et hebescere, eum nec tot undique stimulis agitatus in Henricum sacrilegum insurrexerit, eumque anathemate condemnaverit, nimis tenax præstiti, immo per vim et metum extorti juramenti. Sed et quod ejusdem proditoris usum amicitiæ retinuerit, et quod ex adverso undique magno animo insurgentes, et zelo catholicæ Ecclesiæ libertate læsæ æstuantes papa represserit, magnam ipse sibi notam incussit."—*Ann.*, an. 1112, c. 17. Pascal did not deserve such severity; but it is certain that his correspondence with Henry V., proved in *Cod. Epist. Udalr.*, Nos. 266 to 271, shows an equivocal attitude on his part. We have elsewhere reproduced this extract from the most illustrious defender of pontifical authority and infallibility, printed at Rome itself, to show how great was, in the seventeenth century, the independence of Ultramontane writers.

which had at all times been limited by the rights of the Church and those of the great secular or ecclesiastical vassals. From day to day Henry allowed his ambitious designs to become more and more visible; the mask of humility and religion which he had put on, the better to profit by the despotic and schismatic measures of Henry IV., no longer deceived any one. But active, persevering, and, above all, artful, like his father, the young monarch flattered himself that he should succeed where his father had failed. It was Henry V.'s conspicuous bad faith towards the Church which made the princes understand all the danger which was threatening their independence. Little by little his perfidies, which were always unveiled in the end, separated from him most of the great vassals of the empire, who had been too often deceived to be able to be so for very long. To any one else it would have been easy to establish the peace and dignity of the empire solidly on ancient and legitimate bases. But Henry V. unscrupulously sacrificed the future, and the true strength of the imperial authority, to a dream of despotism for which the Catholic world was not yet ripe.[1] He had, above all, alienated hearts by the arrest of the Count Palatine Sigefroy (the first lay prince of the empire), who, imprisoned at Würzburg in 1109, under pretext of treason, had to be released three years afterwards for want of proof.[2] The emperor had also created for himself, almost at the same time, a redoubtable rival in the person of Lothaire, Count of Suplingenberg,[3] brother-in-law of the Count Palatine. The latter, according to tradition, was descended from Witikind, and, according to history, from a very warlike and chivalrous race. His father had died gloriously fighting for the

[1] *Politische Geschichte Deutschland unter der Regierung der Kaiser Heinrich V. und Lothar III., von Dr. Eduard Gervais*, Leipsic, 1841, vol. i. pp. 20–22. A valuable work, in spite of many concessions made to rationalist idolatry, and which has thrown the strongest light on this little understood epoch of German history.

[2] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ad 1109; GERVAIS, i. p. 55.

[3] A castle near Helmstadt, in Brunswick.

Church and the freedom of the empire, against Henry IV.[1] Lothaire[2] himself had begun his career brilliantly, when fourteen years of age, at the battle of Gleichen, and had recently distinguished himself against the Slavs of the island of Rügen and of Brandenburg. Thus the Duchy of Saxony, the most important in the empire, becoming vacant by the death of the last male of the race of the Billungs, Henry V. hastened to bestow it upon Lothaire, in order to escape confirming the hereditary principle, which would have called to the succession a relation of the last duke by the female line. The emperor, in thus acting, expected to turn to his own profit the great influence which Lothaire enjoyed, less on account of his riches than because of the importance of his family on the mother's side, and his marriage with Richenza, the co-heiress of the great county of Brunswick and of the powerful house of Nordheim.[3]

On the emperor's return from his triumphant expedition to Rome, in which the princes and nobles of northern Germany had taken no part, the discontent of the latter became more and more manifest. The emperor, having attained the height of his wishes both by gaining the right of investiture and by acquiring an extent of power always denied to his father, no longer put any restraint upon himself. Sometimes directly, sometimes by means of inferior vassals devoted to him, he encroached on the right and inheritances of the most powerful nobles, pronouncing arbitrary confiscations with the object of increasing his own immediate domains, and of enfeebling those who might one day become his rivals.[4]

[1] At Hohenburg, in 1075. [2] In 1106.

[3] His mother, Hedwige, had married, as her second husband, Duke Thierry of Lorraine, by whom she had Duke Simon of Lorraine and two daughters, married to Count Seighart of Bavaria and the Count of Holland. Through his father, Lothaire represented the house of Waldeck. His grandmother was niece of St. Bruno, martyr and apostle of Prussia.—GERVAIS, i. 9–18.

[4] Of the four great duchies of Germany, Henry had already secured Suabia, by giving it to his nephew Frederic of Hohenstaufen. Later,

The first conflict between the emperor and Lothaire arose from a dispute as to the county of Stade, which the duke, while still a minor, had procured to be adjudged to himself, although he had as rival a creature of the emperor.[1]

A more serious rupture occurred in 1112, on the subject of the succession of the house of Weimar Orlamunde, claimed by the Count Palatine Sigefroy, who had been newly released from prison, in consequence of energetic remonstrances on the part of his neighbours.[2] Sigefroy having succeeded, by his eloquent account of the miseries of his captivity, in rousing the whole of Saxony, gathered round him to defend his cause the Landgrave Louis of Thuringia, the Counts Wiprecht of Groitsch, father and son, the Palatine Frederic of Sommerschenburg, the Margrave Rodolph of Nordmark, the Bishop of Halberstadt, and, finally, Duke Lothaire, who, being Sigefroy's brother-in-law, was naturally placed at the head of this coalition of the princes of the North against Henry's incessant usurpations. The emperor received a more severe blow in the desertion of his chancellor-minister and most intimate confidant through many years,[3] Archbishop Albert of May-

in 1116, he gave Franconia to his other nephew, Conrad. These two brothers were sons of his sister Agnes and of Frederic I. of Hohenstaufen; the emperor married this Agnes, after Hohenstaufen's death, to Leopold, Margrave of Austria, head of the house of Babenberg. Duke Welf of Bavaria, long ago reconciled to the imperial court, had all Upper Germany under his authority from Alsace to Hungary. He also tried to secure the towns by concessions made to the detriment of the bishops and nobles, as at Spires and Worms.

[1] The princes of Saxony were chiefly alienated by the usurpation of Frederic Count of Stade, the emperor's creature, a man of obscure and uncertain origin, son of an Englishwoman shipwrecked (and consequently reduced to slavery, according to the barbarous custom against which the pope and the councils had so often protested). He was accused of the murder of three Danish bishops. But Duke Lothaire and the Margrave Rodolph of Nordmark overthrew him, in spite of the efforts of Henry V.—GERVAIS, pp. 77–82, and Alber. Stad. and Krantzus.

[2] GERVAIS, i. 56–95; *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1112.

[3] He was of the house of the Counts of Saarbruck.

ence,[1] who everywhere, but especially in Italy, had been the most intelligent, most active, and boldest instrument of the imperial violence, artifices, and plots. Strange to say, hardly had this politician without a conscience, who was regarded as the chief author of the pope's imprisonment,[2] this minister of triumphant iniquity, been invested by his master with the primatial crosier of Mayence, which was the magnificent reward of his crimes against the papacy, than he all at once became Henry's most implacable and most dangerous adversary. This amazing transformation has long puzzled those who sought to explain it by temporal motives;[3] but Catholic minds will see in it one of those marvellous revolutions by which it pleases God to change his enemies into the ministers of His mercy, either by a sudden touch of His grace, as in the case of St. Paul, or by the mere grace of the episcopate, as in the case of St.

[1] "Cujus oris et cordis unanimitate ipse imperator agebat."—SUGER, *De vit. Lud. Gr.*, c. 9.

[2] "Hujus maximi sceleris auctor dicitur Albertus."—OTT. FRISING., *Chron.*, vii. 14.

[3] "Ambitione magis quam pro justitia," says the *Chron. Petershusdunn. ap Ussermann. Germ. sacr. prodromus.* But what ambition could this be except to restore her rights to the Church? Gervais (i. p. 101) thinks the change must be attributed to the desire Albert must have felt to be consecrated by the pope and to obtain a cardinal's hat. But we are surprised to see a historian, usually so discriminating, satisfied with such futile reasons. Albert had no need of the pope's consecration; none of his immediate predecessors had had it; when he was consecrated after his release, it was by one of his suffragans. Besides, Pascal, who had consented to crown Henry, would not probably have refused to consecrate Henry's prime minister, if required. As to the cardinalate (the cardinal's hat was unknown then, and until the Council of Lyons in 1250), that dignity was inferior to the one of archbishop-primate of Germany which Albert had attained. At this period the bishops sat and signed before the cardinal-priests, even in councils held at Rome, and no foreign bishop ever appears among the cardinal-bishops. We even find that while the mere priests invested with the character of legates were almost always cardinals, the bishop-legates, such as Guy of Vienne and Gerard of Angoulême, were not so. Richard, Cardinal and Abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles, legate of Gregory VII., after having been elected Archbishop of Narbonne in 1106, no longer used the title of cardinal.—D. VAISSETTE *Hist. de Languedoc*, ii. 344.

Thomas of Canterbury and this very Albert whose vicissitudes we are about to describe.[1]

Already various symptoms of the archbishop's change had disquieted the emperor, who reproved him for a pride and pretension unsuited to his antecedents;[2] and when the report of the sentence of excommunication, pronounced at Vienne on the very territory of the empire, had been spread by the cares of Archbishop Guy,[3] Albert's attitude became so hostile that the emperor thought it necessary to have him arrested. Led before Henry and bidden to explain his good intelligence with the insurgent princes, and his various usurpations of territory, the archbishop replied "that he had only defended the cause of the Church, which he was bound never to abandon, and that he would permit no one to despoil her."[4]

The emperor caused him to be shut up in his own castle of Trifels, where, amidst the torments of hunger, and of the most barbarous treatment,[5] he was able to prove his obedience to that Church which he had formerly so basely betrayed.[6]

The pope vainly tried to intercede in favour of the prelate,[7] and to obtain his release from this imprisonment,

[1] "Hic simul ut infulas accepit episcopales, mutatur in virum alterum. . . ."—BARON., *Ann.* 1112, c. 19.

[2] See the letter in which Henry enumerates his complaints against him. —RAUMER., *Hist. des Hohenstaufen*, vol. i. b. ii. c. 2; ex *Cod. Palat.*, MS. No. 271; and cf. LUDEN, ix. 638, No. 1.

[3] *Chron. Urspery.*, ann. 1112. Gervais thinks that Albert must have been in correspondence with the Fathers of the Council of Vienne, simply because he was not included in the decree of excommunication. The reason seems inconclusive. Helmold, in his *Chron. Slav.* (i. c. 40), says expressly that the excommunication was what turned Albert against the emperor.

[4] *Chron. Halberst.*, p. 131, in *Leebrut. script. Brunsw. Rer.*, vol. i.

[5] "Diversis tormentis et incredibili famis inedia afflixit eum."—OTT. FRISING., vii. 14.

[6] "Imperator non nisi propter Romanæ Ecclesiæ obedientiam carceris etiam mihi captivo tenebras intulit."—GUDEN, *Coll. dipl.*, p. 118, ap. GERVAIS, p. 102.

[7] By a letter of Jan. 25, 1113. The friendly tone of this letter agrees

which, being decreed without the judgment of his peers, constituted a new and flagrant violation of the liberties of the empire, and of the right of the princes,[1] in the person of the chief among them.[2] It became necessary to have recourse to arms.[3] But the capture and burning of the episcopal city of Halberstadt by the emperor, the victory obtained by his lieutenant, Roger of Mansfeld, over the allied princes at Warnstädt[4]—where the Count Palatine Sigefroy was mortally wounded, and the Count of Groïtsch made prisoner—put an end to this insurrection in its very first stage. Henry then hastened to Lorraine to defend his partisan, Bishop Richard of Verdun, against the attacks of the young Count Regnaud de Bar. The latter, made prisoner by the emperor, was brought before the impregnable fortress of Mouzon, which his young countess was defending. Henry caused a gallows to be set up in sight of the place, and told the countess that if she did not open the gates by the next day her husband should be hanged. On the very night when these things were passing, the countess gave birth to a son; the garrison, moved by her situation, hastened to swear fealty and homage to the newborn child, and announced to the besiegers that even if their lord were hanged another would remain to them, for whom they would guard the fortress to death.[5] The emperor was obliged to raise the siege, and in his rage would have executed his prisoner, had not the princes

ill with the ratification of the decree of the Council of Vienne given three months previously, and testifies to the equivocal attitude of the pope.

[1] RAUMER, vol. i. b. ii. c. 2.

[2] The Archbishop of Mayence, as arch-chancellor, had precedence over all the other princes, ecclesiastical or lay; he was also the first of the seven electors.

[3] "Hæc et his similia scandalorum zizania murmur infinitum in nuper pacato regno suscitant."—*Ann. Saxo.*, ann. 1112.

[4] February 28, 1113.

[5] See the details in OTT. FRIS., *De gest. Frid.*, b. i. c. 11; in Alberic. Trium Fontium. . . .

who surrounded him threatened him with the anger of Heaven.[1] Meantime the news of his excommunication spread more and more, and gradually detached the populace from a power which pressed so heavily upon all. As the holy Otto, Bishop of Bamberg, who had always been anxious to keep himself in union with Rome,[2] would no longer come to court, Henry chose to go to Bamberg himself for the celebration of Christmas, either in order to hide from the people a disagreement which could not but be injurious to him, or else to try the prelate's fidelity.[3] At the same time, he judged this moment favourable for the completion of his union, long ago decided, with Matilda, the young daughter of Henry I., King of England. This alliance was to draw closely together the head of the empire and the most powerful sovereign of the West. The latter had long contested with the Roman Church the right of investiture; and since the death of Anselm of Canterbury[4] had renewed all the evil practices of his worthless brother, William Rufus, by leaving the primatial see of Canterbury vacant, and refusing permission to the apostolic legates to enter his kingdom.[5] The marriage took place at Mayence, on the feast of the Epiphany, 1114, with extraordinary pomp.

The emperor desired that all the princes should be pre-

[1] He replied: "Turbato suæ iræ oculo, 'Cœlum cœli Domino, terram autem dedit filiis hominum.'"—Ott. Fris., *De gest. Frid.*, b. i. c. 11.

[2] See above.

[3] "Hoc non simpliciter, quia virum Dei Ottonem urbis episcopum propter quædam jam in regno orientia scandala curiam frequentare renuentem ex parte suspectum habebat."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1114. It is added that the bishop conducted himself with so much prudence and so great a display of magnificence that he overcame the king's animosity.

[4] We may remember the anxiety which he felt when, in 1107, he saw Pascal tolerate in Henry V., without excommunication, investitures which were forbidden to him. Anselm informed the pope of it, who answered: "Investituras Ecclesiarum . . . nec tolerasse nos aliquando, nec toleraturos scias."—Ap. Ep. Anselm., iii. 153.

[5] Eadmer, *Hist. Novor.*, pp. 68–91.

sent at this ceremony,[1] and they came thither trembling.[2] In the midst of the solemn assembly, Henry obliged Duke Lothaire to come barefoot, and wearing a robe of frieze, to make his submission and to be pardoned for his revolt.[3] Not content with imposing this humiliation on the most formidable of his rivals, Henry caused Count Louis of Thuringia, who had supposed himself safe in the shelter of the imperial hospitality, to be seized and thrown into prison.[4] The princes of the empire were exasperated by this new attack upon their dignity, but terror restrained them.[5] Henry seemed, and believed himself to be, at the height of fortune and of power. His marriage secured to him the support of England and Normandy; all who had dared to resist him were expiating their boldness in his dungeons, or trembled, vanquished, before him. Armed with the right of investiture, he disposed as he would of dioceses and abbeys; the secular and ecclesiastical power were both, so to speak, at his feet. But this moment of supreme splendour was the dawn of his decline and fall.

The princes understood that the fate of the German feudal constitution was in the balance. They understood also, as their fathers had done under Henry IV., how far the cause of the Church was inseparable from their own. It was evident, in fact, that Henry V., when he triumphed over the resistance of the Holy See and obtained that right

[1] "Ubi etiam vix aliquas, aut certe nullum de magnatibus abesse volunt."—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.*

[2] "Multi de principibus sine lætitia interfuerunt."— *Chron. S. Petr. Erf.*, p. 207, ap. RAUMER.

[3] "Nudis pedibus, sago indutus, coram omnibus. . . ."—OTT. FRIS., *Chron.*, b. vii. c. 15. None of the historians who find so atrocious the voluntary humiliation of Henry IV. at Canossa, before him whom he believed to be the vicar of God, cry out against the abasement of this most powerful prince of the empire before the temporal ruler.

[4] "Qui se putabat bene in gratia imperatoris esse."—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.*

[5] "Quæ res multos principum contra imperatorem exacuit." — *Ibid.* "Tantum usque ad id temporis timor principes invaserat, ut nullus rebellare audeat."—OTTO FRISING., *loc. cit.*

of investiture which he arrogated to himself, had destroyed the most solid security for their independence. Instead of ecclesiastical princes, independent by election, as the lay princes were by their hereditary succession, there would soon be in the bishoprics and metropolitan sees only creatures of the emperor, instruments of the preponderating royal will. Instead of a king first elected by the assembly of princes according to the immemorial national law, and then confirmed and consecrated by the Church, after she had received his oaths; instead of a chief responsible to the Church and nobility for the good order and the honour of the country, and for the peace of faithful subjects, Germany, and all that depended on the empire, was threatened with the rule of a Cæsar of ancient Rome, or of degenerate Byzantium, who would trample under foot the liberties of the nobles, and confiscate to his own uses both the moral power and the material riches of the Church. A pagan despotism was on the point of replacing a tempered, limited, and diffused Christian authority; this would be the fruit of Henry's proud triumph at Mayence, but this was certain, sooner or later, once more to identify the cause of the Church with that of the German constitution and the independence of the nobles; and such an identification, which would secure victory to the allies, must last until the contest reached its final issue.[1]

The revolt, of which the plan was arranged at Mayence,[2] was as general as it was formidable. The Saxons, who were accustomed, as in the time of Gregory VII., to be foremost in the struggle for ancient liberties against imperial

[1] Gervais, in his History of Henry V. (3rd and 4th sections, pp. 123, and 153–155), has clearly shown the lawfulness of the prince's cause, and the motives which led them to see the necessity for an alliance with the Church. In his excellent reflections on the essence of the Germanic constitution, he destroys the pretensions of those who try to find in it the origin of modern monarchies and their bureaucracy.

[2] "Verum in hac curia quo pene omnes principes regni confluxerant conspirationes fiunt, ac ex tunc non solum occulto consilio, sed et publica contra eum machinamenta disponuntur."—Ott. Frising., *loc. cit.*

despotism, were, this time, outstripped by the princes of Lorraine, Westphalia, and the banks of the Lower Rhine. Cologne, the most powerful city of the empire, joined them, and its archbishop, Frederic, placed himself at the head of the insurrection. Henry, surprised and furious, at first tried to besiege Cologne. He failed; and before the end of this very year 1114, begun with such splendour, he had been twice completely beaten by the confederates, near Bonn, and near Andernach. Thus vanquished on the Rhine, he turned towards Saxony, and tried to reduce it in the midst of winter. But there a yet more shameful reverse awaited him. The armies met in the woods of Welfsholz,[1] near Eisleben, and there fought for a whole day. The insurgents, commanded by Duke Lothaire, though but half the number of the imperialists, obtained a complete victory. Roger of Mansfeld, to whom Henry had promised Lothaire's duchy, was killed, and the emperor fled into Bavaria.[2] The Saxon victors built a chapel on the battlefield where they had destroyed the germs of autocratic despotism,[3] and placed in it a statue of a warrior armed after the fashion of their ancestors, whose freedom they had so gloriously maintained.[4] And they determined the new religious character of the war by refusing Church burial to the vanquished who had been killed in the service of an excommunicated master.[5]

A new personage now appeared in Germany, to confirm that character and to give a strong impulse to the efforts of the Catholics. Cardinal Conon, Bishop of Palestrina, who, from the shores of Syria, while Europe was still silent, had first dared to fling against the emperor his sentence of excommunication, obtained in 1114 his appointment as legate,

[1] February 11, 1115.

[2] *Vita Viperti.*, ap. GERVAIS, i. 135.

[3] GERVAIS, i. 154.

[4] The peasants made a saint of this statue: "Quasi Saxones victoriam ipsius auxilio habuerint."—CORNER., p. 657; *Dodectur.*, ann. 1115; KRANTZ, *Hist. Sax.*, v. 36., ap. GERVAIS, *loc. cit.*

[5] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1115.

and used it to push to extremities the war with Henry. By birth Conon belonged to the great nobility of the empire, and by the monastic life which he had long led he was connected with the purest and most active element of the Church. He began his functions in northern France, and first of all held a council at Beauvais,[1] where were nearly all the bishops of the provinces of Rheims, Bourges, and Sens. There he promulgated, for the second time, and in their name, the sentence of anathema against the emperor. He then regulated various grave interests of the Church and the country, provided for the security of ecclesiastical property,[2] and again put in force the most important decrees of Gregory VII. and Urban II. The creation of communes among the citizens of the principal episcopal cities in the province of Rheims was cruelly agitating these neighbourhoods.[3] The Bishop of Laon had just been massacred and his cathedral burned[4] by the citizens, exasperated by the suppression of their new commune. Godefroy, the holy Bishop of Amiens, whom we have seen presiding at the emperor's condemnation by the council of Vienne, had granted a commune to his episcopal city; but, in despair at the disorders and sacrilege which resulted,[5] he sent his ring and sandals to the metropolitan of Rheims, and returning to the cloistered life which he had unwillingly left, retired first to Cluny and afterwards to the Grande Chartreuse. A nobleman, equally sanguinary and

[1] December 6, 1114.

[2] We find, in the Acts of this council, this curious avowal: "Cum viderent multos laicos non solum Ecclesiis nil conferre, imo quod nequius est, quæ a fidelibus et Deum timentibus collata sunt, violenter, si liceat, auferre."—D'ACHERY, *Spicileg.*, vol. i. p. 634, in fol.

[3] We shall return farther on to the discussion of the nature of this communal revolution in its relation to the Church.

[4] At Easter 1112.

[5] Guibert de Nogent, the sworn enemy of the communes, said of him: "Turbam moverat quam sedare non poterat."—*De vit. sua*, iii. 14. But Nicholas, his biographer and companion, says: "Quod tot sæcularium tumultuum tempestates ferre non posset."—Ap. MABILL., b. lxxii.

perfidious, Thomas de Marle, son of Enguerrand de Coucy, had mingled in all these discords, sometimes to protect the assassins, sometimes, as at Amiens, to burn a church quite filled with innocent victims, and always to oppress the cause of right, the poor, and the monasteries. The legate Conon punished this felon with the sword of St. Peter, excommunicated him, and declared him incapable of bearing the shield of a knight, "seeing that he is a criminal, infamous, and an enemy of the name of Christian."[1]

At the same council, the deputies of Amiens demanded the return of their bishop, although he had written from his beloved solitude that he was unworthy of the episcopate. The prelates having again assembled at Soissons,[2] sent an order to the Chartreaux to restore their novice to the Church. All wept with him, but they dared not keep him. Godefroy therefore left them, but as he went, says the hagiographer, he constantly turned, with eyes full of tears, to look once more at the peaceful Chartreuse where he had hoped to end his days.[3] But Conon knew the full value of a holy bishop in these stormy days; and when Godefroy, emaciated by his monastic austerities, reappeared before his brethren assembled in council at Rheims, the legate severely reproached him for having abandoned the charge God had confided to him, and neglected the salvation of many only to care for his own.[4] In this council of

[1] "Innumerarum pulsatus molestia querelarum, Ecclesiarum, pauperum et orphanorum, derogationum, tyrannidem mucrone B. Petri, anathemate scilicet generali detruncans, cingulum militarem ei, licet absenti decingit, ab omni honore, tanquam sceleratum, infamatum, Christiani nominis inimicum, omnium judicio deponit."—SUGER, *De Vit. Lud. Gross.*, p. 306, ap. DUCH.

[2] January 6, 1115.

[3] *Vit. S. Godefr.*, auct. Nicolao, ap. SURIUM, 8th Nov.

[4] *Ibid.* Godefroy returned to Amiens, where he was joyfully received, but the communists soon made him endure many troubles; he was obliged to besiege their tower in concert with the king. See A. THIERRY, *Lettres sur l'histoire de France*, pp. 336, 337, MABILL., *Ann.*, b. lxxii. No. 107. It is generally thought that he died in this same year 1115; but

Rheims,[1] which was very numerous, Conon promulgated, for the third time, the sentence of excommunication against Henry. Leaving to his colleagues—Guy of Vienne and Gerard of Angoulême—the care of watching, in many other councils, over the discipline and liberty of the Church of France, the Bishop of Palestrina turned towards the Rhine to meet Archbishop Frederic of Cologne. The latter had been obliged to warn his suffragans to pay no heed to the words of certain bishops in which they maintained that an archbishop could not excommunicate a king who did not belong to his spiritual domains. In opposition to this opinion, the legate cited Theodosius excommunicated by Ambrose.[2] Frederic, at the news of the anathema promulgated against Henry at Beauvais, had addressed himself repeatedly to Bishop Otho of Bamberg to exhort him to make a stand against the oppression under which the Church was groaning.[3] "If the zeal of God's house," he said to him, "or the love of the Church, the true house of God, has devoured the marrow of your bones, do not, through excess of patience, longer conceal the desolation and cruel profanation of God's heritage. See how, by the divine mercy, a great door is opened, that truth, too long silent, may make herself heard, that our liberty, too long oppressed, may raise her head; see how the holy Roman Church lifts up her voice for herself and for us. France is joined to us; Saxony, as you

M. Guérard, conseiller-auditeur of the Court of Amiens, in a remarkable Memoir, inserted in vol. vi. of the *Mem. de la Société d'Antiquit. de Picardie*, has proved that he was still living in 1121, and fixed his death on the 8th November of that year.

[1] March 28, 1115.

[2] In MART., *Ampliss. Coll.*, i. 664. "Denuntiamus vobis in nomine Domini ut non cito moveamini a vestro sensu, tam dictis pseudofratrum nostrorum . . . quibus ex ore domini papæ efficaciter respondemus, quia etsi nobis parochiali jure commissus non fuerit, auctoritate tamen Spiritus sancti et SS. Patrum, pro tanto scelere merito excommunicare debuimus."

[3] "Ad defensionem vel saltem ad liberam deplorationem hujus quem videtis gravissimi Ecclesiæ casus."

may have heard, cries the truth aloud;[1] who, then, can remain insensible while all the power of the Church is being used only for the profit of courtiers and palace servants? when diocesan synods, annual councils, and all the forms of ecclesiastical administration are transformed into royal tribunals to fill the purse of the prince's creatures?[2] when episcopal sees are given up to royal farmers, who, without a thought of the good of souls, care only to fill the insatiable maw of the royal revenue?[3] It is our duty, who are pillars of God's Church, and called upon to guide the bark of Peter through the stormy waves of the world, so to hold the helm that she is not, by our negligence, broken upon the rock of impious tyranny,[4] that we may not deserve the shame of being counted among those whom the prophet calls dumb dogs, unable to bark. As for me, dearest brother, I promise you that by the grace of God neither tribulation, nor anguish, nor death, shall hinder me from the free confession of that faith which I have embraced. Our duty, as you know, is to brave death for the cause of Jesus, that the life of Jesus may one day be manifested in our mortal bodies."[5]

The letter ends with an announcement of the decrees pronounced by the legate Conon. Otho, who was nearly

[1] "Iterum, venerande frater, iterum idem dicimus, si zelus, . . . si amor Ecclesiæ . . . vos medullitus comedit, ne . . . ulterius dissimuletis. Ecce magnum nobis ostium apertum est . . . ut libertas diu suppressa cervicem erigat. . . . Jungit se nobis Francia, libero, sicut audistis, ore, veritatem Saxonia profitetur."

[2] "Quia omnis Ecclesiastici vigoris auctoritas aulicis et palatinis in quæstum versa est. Synodales episcoporum . . . omnes denique Ecclesiastici ordinis administrationes in regalem curiam translatæ sunt, ut illorum marsupiis inserviant."

[3] "Quibus regales villici præsident . . . dum tantum terrenis lucris regalis fisci os insatiabile repleatur."

[4] "Ne nobis segniter torpentibus . . . impiæ tyrannidis scopulis allisa convellatur."

[5] "Ex hac qua cœpimus veritatis libera professione nec tribulatio, nec angustia, nec mors, nec vita separabit."—*Cod.* Ep. *Udal.*, No. 277, written between the councils of Beauvais and Rheims.

related to the legate,[1] was not deaf to this appeal,[2] and seconded the prelate with all his power. Both, without loss of time, convoked a council at Cologne,[3] and there, on Easter Monday, fulminated against Henry V. the fourth sentence of excommunication pronounced against him since the council of Vienne.[4] Then, leaving the continuation of his work to his colleague, the legate Dietrich, who had arrived from Hungary, Conon returned to France to hold a fifth council which he convoked at Châlons-sur-Marne.[5] The Norman bishops and abbots whom, in virtue of his apostolic authority, he had invited thither, having been detained by King Henry I., the emperor's father-in-law, the legate deposed several of them for being more ready to obey their temporal suzerain than their spiritual chief,[6] and afterwards renewed, for the fifth time, the sentence of excommunication against Henry V.; so that the most powerful sovereigns of the West were simultaneously punished by the Church in defence of her rights and liberties.

The terrible sentence, once openly published throughout Germany, could not fail to give a new impulse to the war.[7] It was thus published by Cardinal Theodoric, at the assembly of Goslar (September 8, 1115), the cardinal having been commissioned by the pope to reconcile to the Church the Archbishop of Magdeburg and other prelates who had tolerated lay investiture.

Duke Lothaire on one hand, and Archbishop Frederic of Cologne on the other, were daily pressing more closely on the emperor's lieutenants and allies.[8] Henry, seeing his star

[1] "Salutat vos dominus Chuono, pronepos tuus."—*Cod.* Ep. *Udal.* No. 277.

[2] At Christmas 1115 he was at Cologne.

[3] April 19, 1115.

[4] For the first time on German territory.

[5] July 12, 1115.

[6] The King of England was indignant, and complained bitterly to the pope.—EADMER, *Hist. Novor.*, b. v.; SIMEON DUNELM., *Hist. de gest. reg. Ang.*, ad ann. 1115.

[7] "Saxonum consensus ad resistendum illi magis ac magis roboratur."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1115.

[8] *Chron. Ursperg.*, *Ann. Saxo.*, ad ann. *pass.* "Fredericus . . . totis viribus insequitur eum et fautores ejus, oppida et castella expugnat, et omnia

pale, desired to treat. He convoked a general diet at Mayence for All Saints' Day, promising there to listen to all complaints, and to repair all mischiefs, at the will of the princes.[1] But as no one believed in him, no one answered his appeal.[2]

At Mayence, where the emperor was staying, waiting for the time of the meeting, the people revolted, supported by the knightly vassals of the metropolitan see, and with arms in their hands demanded the deliverance of their archbishop.[3] To save his own life, Henry was obliged to yield.[4] Adalbert, after three years of the hardest captivity, left his prison, pale and reduced to a skeleton.[5] His first deed was a formal act of submission to the legate Theodoric, whom he invited to attend a council at Cologne, to be held at Christmas. The legate died on the journey; but Adalbert, who possessed all the necessary qualities, soon became the soul and head of the league of which Duke Lothaire was the arm.[6]

ad eum pertinentia ferro et igne vastat."—ALBERIC. TRIUM FONTIUM, *Chron.*, ann. 1115.

[1] "Ubi . . . de sibi objectis satisfactionem, de suis extraordinarie vel juveniliter gestis correctionem ad senatusconsultum repromisit."—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.*

[2] "Præter paucos episcopos nemo principum adventabat."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Moguntini . . . urbis familia, tam nobiles, tam ministeriales."—*Chron. Ursperg., Ann. Hildesh.*, ann. 1115. Cf. LÜDEN, vol. ix. b. xx. c. 6, not. 19; GERVAIS, i. 145, not. 1.

[4] In his letter to the people of Mayence (in *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 319), Henry affirms that he released him only after he had sworn to remain quiet and given hostages. We may doubt this, especially if we compare this letter with the one which precedes it in the same collection (No. 318), in which Henry affirms that the pope, in presence of all the cardinals, had disavowed the council of Vienne, condemned the legates Theodoric and Conon, with the Archbishops of Cologne, Mayence, and Salzburg, and declared that all who made war on the emperor were pagans and sacrilegious persons. We can easily believe that Pascal acted equivocally towards the emperor; but such proceedings as these contradict all that is preserved in contemporary monuments, part of which we have quoted.

[5] "Vix ossibus hærentem."—*Ann. Saxo.*, ann. 1115; OTTO FRISING., vii. 14.

[6] See STENTZEL, i. 666.

Surrounded by the fourteen German bishops who had already deserted the schism, he was consecrated at Cologne the day after Christmas, by Otho the holy Bishop of Bamberg, his suffragan; and in this imposing assembly, in presence of Lothaire and many other lay nobles, the excommunication was again pronounced.[1]

During this time, the emperor, who was keeping the feast of Christmas at Spire with a small number of princes, decided to try a new expedient, and sent Erlung, Bishop of Würzburg, who remained faithful to him, to meet the confederate chiefs. But these chiefs would not even receive the ambassador, declaring that they would hold no intercourse with him until he should be reconciled to the Church, and give up all intercourse with the excommunicated sovereign.

Returning to Spire, the bishop, who now repented of his errors, refused to communicate with the emperor. But Henry compelled him, by threatening him with death, to celebrate mass with him. The unhappy prelate, after he had undergone this violence, fled from the court, obtained absolution yet once more, weeping for his involuntary relapse, and abandoned Henry for ever.[2] To punish the fugitive, Henry separated the duchy of Franconia from the bishopric of Würzburg, and gave it to his nephew, Conrad of Hohenstaufen. But the defection of Erlung of Würzburg made it clear to the emperor that Germany was no longer tenable for him. He resolved to try his fortune again in Italy, formerly so favourable to him, and whither he was summoned by a new and pressing interest, that of disputing with the Church the succession of the great Countess Matilda.

[1] *Ann. Saxo.*, ann. 1116.

[2] "Vitæ periculo coactus missam coram imperatore celebravit, indeque usque ad mortem contristatus latenter discessit, atque rursus communioni pristinæ multis lacrymis reconciliatus ultra imperatoris aspectu simul et gratia caruit."—*Ann. Saxo.*, *loc. cit.*

CHAPTER XII

TRIALS OF THE PAPACY

Henry V. seizes the domains and fortresses of the Countess Matilda.—Lateran Council, where Pope Pascal relates his wrongs and those of the Church.—Pascal indignant that the word heresy should be pronounced in connection with him.—Pascal approves the acts of Conon of Palestrina.—Letter of Frederic of Cologne to the consuls and inhabitants of Milan.—Henry tries to deceive Germany.—The emperor condemned at the council of Benevento.—John of Gaëta elected pope under the name of Gelasius II.—Gelasius becomes a bold defender of apostolic liberty.—The pope finds a refuge in the castle of San Paolo at Ardea.—Henry V. creates an anti-pope.—Gelasius returns to Rome, and then visits France.

MATILDA ended her long and glorious life on July 24, 1115, at the age of sixty-nine, the crucifix pressed to her lips. Before her death she rewarded the devoted affection of her many serfs by setting them all at liberty.[1] It was universally acknowledged throughout Christendom that with the great countess had disappeared not only the richest and most powerful of princesses, but also the most pious woman of whom the lay world could then boast.[2] Shortly before she expired, the countess had received a visit from Abbot Pons of Cluny, whom she had loaded with favours and atten-

1 "Famulos suos innumeros post ejus mortem ingenuos esse jussit, cumque laboraret in extremis, episcopus corpus Dominicum ei tradidit, . . . mittens in manibus ejus crucem Christi, quam dum bajularet et in ea crebra figeret oscula, Oro inquit, te, Christi, quem semper colui, semper amavi, ut sordium mearum digneris mundare piacula."—ANON., *Vit. Mathild.*, c. 17, in MURAT., vol. v. 397.

2 "Qua femina sicut nemo nostris temporibus ditior et famosior, ita nemo virtutibus et religione sub laica professione reperitur insignior."—*Ann. Sax.*, ann. 1115.

tion.[1] Her last public act[2] was a donation to the abbey of Polyrone,[3] whence came her spiritual guide, the holy Bishop Anselm of Lucca. She had chosen her own burial-place there, wishing, as she said, to intrust her body to the care of these pious sons[4] of St. Benedict, because she had always found them foremost among the defenders of that Church which she had served and loved so passionately. Her remains rested there for five hundred years, until the time when the gratitude of a pope decided that the illustrious dust should be placed in the tomb of the popes and martyrs in St. Peter's at Rome.[5]

It will be remembered that Matilda had twice bestowed on the Holy See her vast domains, comprising nearly the whole north of Italy to the Tiber.[6] This was too rich a prey for Henry to abandon. He thought he had acquired a right over that portion of the countess's property which depended

[1] ANON., *Vit., loc. cit.*; DOMNIZO, b. ii. *in fine*. Matilda was seized with a fatal chill while present, although ill, at service of Christmas night with Abbot Pons.

[2] May 4, 1115.

[3] Polyrone was a dependency of Cluny. Matilda had gone there in December 1115 to visit Abbot Alberic, who was also ill. This is what the princess herself says in her last deed: "Cum ego, Mathildis, . . . apud S. Benedictum veniremus . . . illam sanctam congregationem vidimus et super mortificatione eorum compatiens, compunctione misericordiæ, devotione caritatis, ad eorum sustentationem quædam transferre ex nostra largitate curavimus. Itaque coram illo venerabili collegio super sanctum altare B. Benedicti investituram posuimus, condonantes albergariam (jus hospitandi)," &c.

[4] "Te, Benedicte pater, moriens hæc curat amare,
Cœnobiumque tuum ditatur corpore cujus
Cui prece demonstra cœli cognoscere portas."
—DOMNIZO, *loc. cit.*

[5] This translation took place in 1635, under Urban VIII., five hundred and seventeen years after the great countess's death.

[6] She had all Tuscany, the patrimony of St. Peter between Radicofani and the Tiber, the present duchies of Parma, Placentia, Modena, Mantua, great part of Piedmont and Liguria, and many scattered estates in the towns of Tuscany and Lombardy, which insured her a sovereign influence in these countries.

on the empire,[1] and he also claimed the allodial lands and personal property of the princess, in virtue of his relationship, which was very distant, and could in no way prevail against the will of the testatrix.[2] He went to Italy to prosecute this claim in the beginning of 1116. His forces were inconsiderable, but he succeeded in winning many partisans by the contrast of his present moderation with the violence committed in his first expedition.[3]

The better to assure to himself the coveted inheritance, Henry remained for some time quietly in the north of Italy; but a little later he took possession of Canossa and the fortresses of the Apennines, where Matilda had so long defied the imperial power.

The pope at this epoch had partly regained his ascendency in Italy; while the Normans, whose young Duke William, grandson of Robert Guiscard, had received from Pascal the investiture of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily,[4] had recovered

[1] These are the words used by Matilda: "Omnia bona mea jure proprietario tam quæ nunc habueram quam ea quæ in antea acquisitura eram sive jure successionis, sive alio quocumque jure ad me pertineant."—Act of July 17, 1102, ap. LEIBNITZ, *Script. Brunsw.*, and MUR., v. Probably she did not apply the terms, "jure proprietario et pertineant," to imperial fiefs; but it is impossible to distinguish among these vast territories, which had that quality. The term "propria" is also carefully employed by Domnizo:

"Propria clavigero sua subdidit omnia Petro."

Elsewhere:

"Cui proprie telluris sortem subdidit omnem."

[2] See *Table Généalogique*, ap. GERVAIS, i. 160; ex BÜNAN, *Hist. of Frederic Barbarossa*, p. 382. Raumer declares that the claim of the emperor to the allodial possessions and personal property of Matilda was absurd and iniquitous.—*Hist. of the Hohenstauf.*, b. ii. c. 3.

[3] He was especially well received at Venice.—*Chron. Dandol.*, ap. MURATORI, xii. 236–266; GERVAIS, *loc. cit.*

[4] October 1114. He also settled various disputes between the Normans and Beneventines, and at the council of Troja (August 1115) made the Norman princes accept the truce of God for three years. The investiture of Sicily, given to William, only implied the suzerainty over that island, which was held as a sub-fief from the Church by Roger II., son of Roger called the Great, Count of Sicily, and brother of Robert Guiscard. Roger

their importance. In obedience to the pope's exhortations, the Pisans had directed an expedition against the Balearic Islands to destroy Saracen piracy, and had gloriously possessed themselves of Iviça and Majorca.[1] At the same time, the support of these foreigners, and of the new-born municipal republics, was not sufficient to enable the Holy See to dispute with the emperor the succession formally bequeathed by Matilda to St. Peter. Thus we find no mention in contemporary writers of any attempt of the kind on the part of the Church. At this moment, indeed, Henry was showing the most conciliatory intentions towards the sovereign pontiff, to whom he sent Pons, Abbot of Cluny,[2] as his ambassador charged to plead the cause of the empire in the general council assembled at the Lateran in March 1116.

The legate Conon having returned from France, was present at this council, together with a great number of bishops, abbots, dukes, counts, and envoys from all Catholic countries.[3] The first days were devoted to the examination of various local affairs. At one of the first sittings a bishop rose and said to the pope that, after having braved all sorts

II. afterwards united all the conquests of his family, and was the first king of the Two Sicilies.

[1] PANDULP. PISAN., *Vit. Pasc. II.*; LAUR. VERON., *Poem. de bello Balearico*, ap. UGHELLI, *Ital. Sacr.*, vol. iii.; PAGI, *Crit.*, in ann. 1114 and 1115.—See Letter of Henry to Pascal.

[2] *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 273. "Qui et inter utramque partem pro componendis pacifice rebus fidelis et impiger apocrisiarius in . . . studuit."—*Ann. Sax.*, *loc. cit.*

[3] "Synodus universalis concilii congregatis ibidem ex diversis regnis et provinciis episcopis et abbatibus, catholicis ducibus et comitibus, legatis universarum provinciarum quam plurimis."—*Chron. Urspcrg.*, ann. 1116. It is not clear whether it was at this council or that of 1112 that Suger was present, and to which he refers in the following passage of the *Life of Louis le Gros:* "Quod (privilegium) idem dominus papa in magno concilio trecentorum et eo amplius episcoporum judicio Ecclesiæ nobis audientibus conquassavit," p. 290. The *Hist. Litt.*, xii. 364, says that he was present at the council of 1112, but this number of 300 bishops does not agree with that of 126, which is found in the Acts of the Council. See above.

of dangers by sea and by land, the Fathers of the great assembly begged the sovereign pontiff to make known to them his personal opinions, and the doctrines which, at their return home, they ought to teach in their churches.[1]

Pascal began his answer by relating the painful scenes he had witnessed, and the ills inflicted on the Church and the people of God during his captivity. He then expressed himself as follows: "When the Lord had left me His servant, and the people of Rome, in the hands of King Henry, I saw pillage, incendiarism, murder, and adultery daily committed; and I sought any means by which to turn these dreadful calamities away from the Church and people of God. What I have done I did in the hope of delivering God's people. I did it as a man, for I am but dust and ashes. I acknowledge that I did ill, and I beg you now to pray God to pardon me. As to this fatal document, dictated in a prison, I pronounce a perpetual anathema upon it, that its memory may be for ever odious; and I pray you all to forget it." [2]

At these words all the assembly replied, "Amen! Amen!"

Bruno of Segni, always foremost in zeal, cried in a loud voice,[3] "We should bless God that we have heard Pope Pascal condemn with his own mouth a pretended privilege, which covered both heresy and great wickedness." [4]

These words gave some scandal. "If this privilege con-

[1] "Quidam episcoporum de medio surgens, . . . expediendum prius propter quod principaliter convenerant ut evidentius pernoscatur quid dominus Apostolicus sentiat. . . ."—*Ibid.*

[2] "Feci autem ut homo quia pulvis sum et cinis. Fateor me male egisse, sed rogo vos omnes . . . istud autem malum scriptum quod in tentoriis factum est," &c. The pope adds here, in words which are found in most of the decrees and narratives of this affair, and which are untranslatable: "Quod pro pravitate sua pravilegium dicitur." Elsewhere it is said: "Non privilegium, sed pravilegium."

[3] "Altius exorsus est."—*Ibid.* He was crowned in 1183 by Pope Lucius III.

[4] "Quod pravitatem et hæresim continebat."—*Ibid.*

tained heresy," said one of those present, "he who drew it up must have been a heretic!"[1]

But Cardinal John of Gaëta[2] hastened to reply to Bruno: "What! do you venture, in full council and before the bishops, to call the pope a heretic? Certainly the document he signed was bad, but it was in no way heretical."[3] "Not only," said another of the Fathers, "was it not heretical, but we must own that to try to deliver the people was an act worthy of praise."

But Pascal had lost patience at hearing the dreadful word heresy. Commanding silence by a gesture, he cried: "My brethren and my lords, this church has never known heresy; it is she who has fought with and overcome all heresies. Was it not for her that the Son of God prayed when, during his passion, He asked that *Peter's faith might never fail?*"[4]

Next day a new and not less vehement discussion began between Cardinal Conon of Palestrina, who wished to repeat the emperor's excommunication,[5] and the Abbot of Cluny, on one side, and Cardinal John of Gaëta and Peter, son of Leo, the negotiator of Sutri, on the other.[6]

The pope once more interfered, saying—"The primitive Church, in the time of the martyrs, was flourishing before

[1] "Ad hæc quidam cavillatore subjunxit: Si . . . qui illud fecit hæreticus fuit."

[2] The title of Bishop of Gaëta given to Cardinal John in most reprints of the *Chronicle of Auersperg* is a mistake.—BARON., MANSI, COLETTI, &c. It is not given to him in the first edition of 1609. Cardinal John was only abbot and cardinal-deacon, as is proved by his signature at the Lateran Council in 1112. He was afterwards pope under the name of Gelasius II.

[3] "Tu ne hic, et in concilio, nobis præsentibus
Romanum pontificem appellas hæreticum? . . .
Malum quidem fuit, sed hæresis non fuit."

[4] "Ad hæc patientia papæ horrendo hæresis nomine pulsata . . . manu silentium indicens. . . ."

[5] "Sæpius verbum excommunicationis exponere cupienti."

[6] "In faciem resistentibus."

God if not before men. Afterwards emperors and kings were converted, and, like dutiful sons of the Church, honoured their mother, to whom they gave lands, fiefs, dignities, rights, and royal ornaments, as did Constantine and others. Then the Church flourished before men as well as before God. Let our mother and lady, the Church, keep what she has received from kings and princes, and let her dispense to her sons as she sees good." [1] After this Pascal renewed the prohibition established by Gregory VII., under pain of anathema, against all who should give or receive lay investiture. Then Cardinal Conon presented the following request: "Most holy Father," he said, "if I have shown myself your true legate, and if it pleases you to ratify what I have done, be pleased to declare it with your own lips, in presence of this holy council, that all may know I had received authority." [2]

The pope replied: "You have been truly our legate, *a latere*, and all that you and our other brethren, cardinals, bishops, and legates, have done by the authority of this see, I confirm; and I condemn all that you have condemned." [3]

Conon then enumerated the different sentences of excommunication which he had pronounced against the emperor, first at Jerusalem on the earliest report of his crime, and afterwards in Greece, in Hungary, in Saxony, in Lorraine, in France, in five councils, at Rome, and in all the churches; and he concluded by asking that the Fathers of the council should confirm all his acts, as the pope had just done.

The envoys from the Archbishop of Vienne made the same request. Some objections were raised in the assembly,

[1] "Habeat ergo mater et domina nostra Ecclesia sibi a regibus sive principibus collata: dispenset et tribuat filiis suis sicut scit et sicut vult." —*Ibid.*

[2] "Domine Pater, si tuæ placet majestati, si vere tuus fui legatus et quæ feci tibi placentem rate, edicito. . . ."

[3] "Vere legatus ex latere nostro missus fuisti, et quidquid tu, cæteri . . . ego quoque probo et confirmo, quidquid damnaverunt damno."

but all the bishops and abbots were unanimous.[1] Before they separated, the council put an end to the controversy which for several years had been agitating the Church of Milan. The seeds of orthodoxy and regularity, scattered there during long years of struggles against simony by the heroic Luitprand, that priest whose nose and ears had been cut off by the schismatics,[2] had begun to spring up.

Archbishop Grossulanus, whom Luitprand had always opposed, was removed, and his rival, Jordanus of Chiusa, chosen by the party hostile to the emperor, received the croiser from the hands of the sovereign pontiff.[3]

Most of the Lombard bishops being still as much devoted to the imperial cause as in the time of Gregory VII., and the nobles following the same standard, it was of the greatest consequence for the Church to place in the see of Milan, the most important in Italy after Rome, a man devoted to ecclesiastical liberty, and sufficiently influential to gather round him, in support of the Catholic cause, those elements of strength and resistance which were every day growing more powerful in the Lombard municipalities. At this moment Milan was beginning to be the centre of that great struggle which was to last half a century, and to

[1] This is the reading adopted by Fleury, Stentzel, Gervais, &c. The text of the *Chronicle of Auerspery*, the only contemporary authority, is obscure. We think best, therefore, to reproduce it entire: "Orare si demum, ut sicut D. papa legationem suam confirmasset, ita præsentis concilii patres et episcopi concorditer annuerent . . . dum tali ratione et ordine tam variæ et dissonæ multitudinis assensus exquiritur; saniori parte veritati et apertæ rationi nihil contradictum; a paucis submurmuratum, ab episcopis vel abbatibus nullo modo reclamatum." It will be seen that the pope, by a very useless subterfuge, avoided condemning the emperor by name. Thus Baronius says: "Sic videas *quali ambitu* opportuerit excommunicationem confirmari."

[2] He died in 1113. See above.

[3] "Gratiam et virgam pontificalem in ipso theatro suscepit."—LANDULPH. junior, *Chron. Mediol.*, c. 30, ap. MURAT., vol. v. Landulph relates in detail the long struggles which marked the whole pontificate of Grossulanus. They are analysed by FLEURY, b. lxvii. No. 38. Cf. *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1116; *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 258, 259.

bring upon her so many misfortunes, but also so much glory. This *rôle* befitted the ancient city which had not yet ceased to honour the memory of Ambrose, or to keep in mind the wholesome humiliation inflicted on the Emperor Theodosius: it belonged, as of right, to the illustrious town where, for the first time, had been manifested the splendour of that repressive power, till then unknown to the world, given by God to His Church to arm her for her warfare with the powers of this world.

Following the example of Conon and Guy of Vienne, the new archbishop, as soon as he returned from the council, promulgated the sentence of excommunication against Henry.[1] The German princes in revolt against the emperor eagerly grasped at the valuable alliance offered to them beyond the Alps by the little Catholic republic. Archbishop Frederic of Cologne addressed to the consuls, captains, soldiers, and people of Milan, a letter in which he spoke as follows: "We admire the greatness and mercy of God in endowing your city with freedom, to the joy of the whole world; for you offer a brave resistance to all the powers of wickedness. Illustrious city, guard your freedom with the utmost care; that you should do so is the condition of your glory; and be sure that as long as you resist the powers opposed to the Church, so long you will, by the help of Christ, enjoy true liberty. Build your confidence, dearest friends, upon the goodness of your cause, and upon the glory of the name transmitted to you by your fathers, which we all honour (*applaudens unanimitas*). And believe that we are all, whether princes of Lorraine, of Saxony, of Thuringia, or of France, unanimous in our love for you; we make but one body; and you will find us always ready to join you in defending justice and lawful freedom. Ask of

[1] "Henricum . . . una cum clero et populo suo Joanni Crementi cardinali Romano præcipienti in pulpito sanctæ Theclæ excommunicavit."—LANDULPH. jun., c. 31; MURAT., v. 500.

us what help you will, and be certain of our diligence in granting it to you."[1]

The church and city of Milan persevered in the way marked out for them by their traditions; and when, at a later period (1118), the great Lombard[2] vassals endeavoured, at a conference held in the city, to plead the emperor's cause before the archbishop and his suffragans, the latter strongly supported the rights of the Church and the excommunication of Henry V.[3] Unfortunately, they did not succeed in preventing the Milanese from wasting their strength in a sanguinary war against their neighbours at Como, which was carried on for two years.

Meantime the emperor, while occupying himself in uniting the Countess Matilda's domains to his own, called a meeting of the Lombard bishops, most of whom were devoted to him,[4] and sent three of them[5] to the pope, hoping to obtain a reversal of the sentences passed upon him at the various councils. Pascal replied that, in order to keep the oath which had been extorted from him, he had not himself published the anathema against Henry; but that this sentence, having been pronounced by the most eminent members of the Church, could only be remitted by their advice, and in another council.[6] The pope added that the letters

[1] "Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis. . . . Hæc itaque gloriosa cum per universum orbem de te sint dicta, civitas Dei inclyta, conserva libertatem, ut pariter retineas hominis hujus dignitatem: quia quandiu potestatibus Ecclesiæ inimicis resistere niteris, veræ libertatis auctore, Christo Domino adjutore, perfrueris. . . . Sicut in uno corpore sociamur ita in eadem justitia, eadem legum libertate una vobiscum parati inveniemur."—MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Collect.*, vol. i. p. 640.

[2] "Marchiones et comites Longobardiæ." The philosopher St. Marc calls them *military sages, friends of the public good.*—*Hist. d'Italie*, iv. 1057.

[3] LANDULPH. jun., *Hist. Mediol.*, c. 34.

[4] See his letter to Hartwig, Bishop of Ratisbon.—*Cod. Udalr.*, 318.

[5] Those of Placentia, Acqui, and Asti.

[6] "Propter securitatem quam regi licet coactus fecerat, diffitetur, illum se anathematis vinculo colligasse, ab Ecclesiæ tamen potioribus membris excommunicationem connexam non nisi ipsorum consilio denegat se posse dissolvere, concesso nimirum utrinque synodalis audientiæ jure."—*Chron. Ursp.*, ann. 1117.

of the Ultramontanes, and especially of Archbishop Adalbert of Mayence, urged him to remain firm.

Upon this, Henry endeavoured to deceive Germany by a completely false account of the pontifical sentiments,[1] and thus encouraged the people of Rome in their disaffection. They, displeased with the pope's choice of a new prefect, had revolted and driven the holy Father from the city.[2] Just after this, Henry hastened to announce to his friends that he would shortly be in Rome.[3] And he did arrive there in the spring of 1117. This time the pope did not wait for him, but took refuge at Monte Cassino, under the protection of the Norman sword; but he sent, as his legate to the emperor, Maurice Burdin, Archbishop of Braga,[4] who, betraying the cause he was commissioned to defend, consented to crown the emperor during the feast of Easter.[5] The traitor was immediately excommunicated by Pascal, in a council held at Benevento; but Henry was little affected by this. Always seeking to establish his rule in Italy, he

[1] *Cod. Udalr.*, Ep. 317, 318. He there says that the pope, in presence of all the cardinals, had disavowed Conon, Guy of Vienne, and Adalbert; and condemned, as perjured and sacrilegious, all his subjects who had made war on him.—GERVAIS, i. 170, 171. This shows clearly the untrustworthiness of Henry's letters, which Stentzel and Lüden have blindly followed.

[2] See the details of this insurrection, which broke out March 26, 1116, in FALCO BENEVENTANUS, *Chron.*, ann. 1116, ap. MURATORI, vol. v. The pope wished to give this office to Peter, son of Leo, brother of the cardinal; the people desired another Peter, son of the late prefect. Pascal, betrayed by Count Ptolomeo of Tusculum, was obliged to yield.

[3] "His auditis, Henricus . . . lætus effectus, quia non bene cum papa conveniebat, scenia imperialia urbis præfecto et Romanis transmisit, adventum suum illis prænuntians affuturum."—*Chron. Cass.*, iv. 60.

[4] Burdin was a Limousin, distinguished for his eloquence and learning. Bernard, the monk of Cluny, who was Archbishop of Toledo and legate in Spain, having noticed him at the council of Clermont in 1095, took him to Spain, where he became Bishop of Coimbra, and afterwards Archbishop of Braga. He had come to Rome to defend the rights of his metropolitan see against his old benefactor Bernard, who, as Archbishop of Toledo, claimed the primacy of all Spain.—*Vita Mauritii*, ap. BALUZII, *Miscell.*, vol. i. *Chron. Mauriniac*, PAND. PIS., *Vit. Pasch.*

[5] March 25, 1117.

gave his daughter in marriage to Count Ptolomeo of Tusculum, head of a house and party constantly opposed to the papacy. At the same time, he put to death all the Romans who were captured on their way to join the pope at Benevento.[1] At Whitsuntide, Henry returned to Upper Italy,[2] while Pascal ended the year among the Normans, his faithful and valiant defenders.

Towards Christmas, the sovereign pontiff was able to return to St. Peter's and the Leonine city.[3] He was preparing to attack the imperial garrison in Rome when God put an end to his laborious pontificate. He died January 21, 1118.[4] A few days before his death, he assembled the cardinals, and urgently enjoined upon them to persevere in faith and charity, and in cursing the schism and German outrages.[5]

The cardinals chose for Pascal's successor John of Gaëta,[6] deacon and chancellor of the Roman Church, who was then living at Monte Cassino, where, when very young, he had assumed the Benedictine habit.[7] The future head of the Church was summoned, and in a meeting held at a small church near the Capitol, the election was made unani-

[1] *Epist. Gauffrid. Vendoc. ap. Script. Rer. Franc.*, vol. xv. p. 297.

[2] Scarcely had he left Rome when the Prince of Capua, at the pope's request, sent 300 Norman knights, who invaded the Campagna, and pillaged Pagliano. Henry returned, put them to rout, and resumed his journey, "coactus fervore æstatis," says the *Chron. Cassin., loc. cit.*

[3] *Vit. Pasch.*, ap. BARON., ann. 1117, c. 5.

[4] Date fixed by PAGI, *Crit.* in BARON., ann. 1118.

[5] "Ut caverent dolos ab iis qui intus erant et extra in execratione Guibertinorum ac enorminatis Teutonicæ."—BARON., ann. 1118, c. 1 We see from the letter of the Archbishop of Cologne to the Italian cardinals and bishops, after Pascal's death, that the pope had entirely regained the good opinion of the zealous party.—Ap. MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Collect.*, vol. i. p. 641.

[6] He belonged to Gaëta, and was of a very noble family, sometimes supposed to be that of Gaëtani, of which Boniface VIII. was a member, and which still exists at Rome with a ducal title.—PANDULPH PIS., *Vit. Gelasii II.*, cum not. D. Constant. Gaëtani ab Ord. S. B. Rom. 1638 and ap. MURAT., *Script.*, vol. iii. p. 1.

[7] "Ab infantia nutritus et adultus."—EADM., *Hist. nov.*, b. v. p. 92.

mously,[1] in spite of the resistance of the venerable monk, who took the name of Gelasius II.[2] This was the fifth monk since Gregory VII. who was called to the Apostolic See. He had been honoured with the absolute confidence of Urban II., who had drawn him from Monte Cassino and made him a cardinal; and had been named chancellor by Pascal II. on account of his great eloquence.

In the Catholic world the new pope enjoyed a great reputation for honour, talent, and learning;[3] but he had been security for the unfortunate oath extorted from Pascal II. by the emperor; and, on the other hand, the opposition he had made to Cardinal Conon of Palestrina and Bishop Bruno of Segni, at the last Lateran Council, had prejudiced him in the minds of certain very ardent friends of the liberty of the Church. Thus, when Conrad, Archbishop of Salzburg, an exile for the faith, heard, in Germany, of the election of John of Gaëta, he is said to have exclaimed: "No one could have been worse than John; but perhaps Gelasius may be good for something!"[4]

The German Catholics, however, were resolved to acknowledge no pontiff but one faithful to the line marked out by Gregory VII. and his successor. Archbishop Frederic of Cologne peremptorily signified this resolution to the Italian bishops. "If our Pascal's successor is lawfully ordained," he said, "if he follows in the steps of the holy Fathers,

[1] "In monasterio quodam, quod Palladium dicitur, infra domos Leonis et Cencii Frangipani."—PANDULPH. PIS., *loc. cit.*

[2] January 25, 1118. Pandulph quotes the names of all the cardinals present at the election, to the number of four bishops, twenty-six priests, and eighteen deacons; and he adds, "Approbatur ab omnibus, necnon etiam ab episcopis, quorum nulla est prorsus alia in electione præsulis Romani potestas, nisi approbandi."

[3] "Ut per eloquentiam sibi a Domino traditam stylum . . . reformaret," &c. "Industria et litterarum scientia excellentissime roboratus."—*Chron. Moriniac.*, ap. DUCHESNE, iv. 366.

[4] "Nam nullus eorum nequior Johanne; forte in Gelasio poterit aliquod boni esse!"—*Anon. de vita Theotger. episc. Mett.*, ap. MABILL., *Ann.*, b. 73, c. 31.

we will all obey him; but if he proves by his conduct that he is not the minister of God, but of a worldly and excommunicated man, neither his seductions nor his condemnation shall move us!"[1]

Gelasius did not deceive the hopes of those who trusted in his transformation. He who, by His grace, was able to make of the bitterest persecutor of the infant Church the great Apostle of the Gentiles, suddenly changed the timid and vacillating minister of a wavering pontiff into a bold confessor of apostolic freedom. At the very moment when the supreme pontificate, with its terrible responsibilities, weighed most heavily upon him, the pontiff's soul rose to the height of his fortunes; the weak chancellor gave place to the monk whom Urban II. had summoned from the cloister to the great battles of the Church; and the captive of Sutri desired nothing better than to give his life, as St. Peter had done, for the defence of that Church's liberty.[2]

The first act of Gelasius as pope was to address a fraternal greeting to the very Conon whom he had so violently opposed at the Lateran Council, and whom he

[1] This whole letter is very remarkable. After a eulogy of Pascal, already indicated, he says: "Sed quomodo . . . vocatus est ad justitiæ coronam apud Deum repositam, vos, serenissimi Patres, sanctam ne deseratis Ecclesiam, sed ejus imitantes vestigia, omnes qui vestram libertatem imminuere tentaverint damnate sententia. . . . Catholici conatus vestri fautores et adjutores inveniemur in ipso, non desistentes a vestra omniumque bonorum unitate et sacræ Matris nostræ recuperanda libertate. . . . Si Patri nostro successor legitimus Dei ordinatione est substitutus, qui ejus per omnia et sanctorum Patrum sectetur vestigia, omnium nostrum perfruatur obedientia: sin autem non Dei, sed homines terreni et excommunicatorum, quod absit, se fere factis probet antistitem, nullam seductionis suæ vel damnationis nostræ in nobis inveniet subjectionem."—MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Coll.*, vol. i. p. 641; MABILL., *Annal.*, b. 73, c. 30.

[2] "Ita repente cum nomine et animum mutavit, ut tempore perpetuo' quo supervixit, postea piis operibus studens, Ecclesiam mirifice illustraret: adeo ut etiam paratus fuerit, contempta regis tyrannide, pro libertate Ecclesiæ cum Petro et animam ponere."—*Anon. vit. Theotg.*, *loc. cit.*

now begged to continue his legation[1] until he should point him out as the most suitable person for his successor.

The imperialists did not deceive themselves: Cencio Frangipani, one of their leaders, when he heard of the election, ran, sword in hand, to the church where it took place, seized the new pope by the throat, and after having struck and kicked him, so as to bring blood, dragged him by the hair to his own palace, where he ordered him to be chained.[2] At these news, Peter the Prefect, Peter the son of Leo, Stephen the Norman, and other nobles, armed themselves and their men, and joining the Transteverins and all the Roman people, hurried to deliver the pope. The Frangipani, alarmed, hastened to release Gelasius, who was almost immediately afterwards crowned at St. John Lateran.[3] But the unhappy pontiff's trials were not yet ended: before he could be consecrated (for he was only a deacon), he was informed one night that the emperor was within a short distance of St. Peter's, at the head of his troops, and ready for the attack. Gelasius rose hurriedly, and, in spite of his great age, was flung upon a horse, and taken to the Tiber, where he was embarked in a galley bound to Porto. The sea was so rough at the time that it was impossible to put out from shore without risk of perishing. The Germans pursued the fugitives along the coast with a shower of arrows, and threatening to set fire to the galley if they did not immediately give up the pope.[4] Night and

[1] "Tanquam fratrem carissimum officiosissime salutavit."—*Anon. vit. Theoty., loc. cit.* Conon, then in Germany, asked details of the election from the bearer of the letter, and hearing of the unanimity of the suffrage, immediately proclaimed Gelasius.

[2] "Papam per gulam accepit, distraxit, pugnis, calcibus percussit, et tanquam brutum animal intra limen ecclesiæ acriter calcaribus cruentavit . . . per capillos et brachia detraxit . . . ubi cum catenavit et clausit."—PAND. PISAN., *loc. cit.*, an eyewitness.

[3] He was not yet a priest, and, according to the custom of the time, could only be ordained and consecrated at the next Ember days.—FALCO BENEV., No. 1118.

[4] "Imperator furtiva et inopinata velocitate Romam veniens."—Ep.

the storm, however, having stopped the pursuit, Cardinal Hugh took the pope on his shoulders, and carried him through the darkness to the castle of San Paolo at Ardea, whence he was taken, half dead, to Terracina, and thence to Gaëta.[1]

So dearly did the unfortunate Gelasius pay for the pontificate with which he had been invested against his will; and such were the sinister events which interposed between his coronation and his consecration!

When the emperor heard that his prey had escaped him, he again had recourse to stratagem: he invited Gelasius to come to Rome to be consecrated, saying that he should have much pleasure in being present at the ceremony, and so confirming it. He added that, if Gelasius would sanction the agreement made with Pascal, he, Henry V., would engage immediately to swear fidelity to the pontiff; but he also ventured to declare that, in the opposite case, he would cause another pope to be enthroned.[2]

Gelasius replied that he was ready to terminate, either by a treaty or by any just means, a quarrel which disturbed the Church and the kingdom; but, he added, he must defer the affair to a future time—that is to say, to the following St. Luke, when he should be at Milan or Cremona (cities then in rebellion against the emperor). For the rest, before that date, the holy Father would take council with his brethren, whom God had made judges of the dispute.[3]

Gelas. II. ad Gall. in Conc., xii. 1240. "Quidam intempestæ noctis silentio. . . . Henricum . . . armatum contra papam ad S. Petri porticum adventasse . . . jam pene senio et infirmitate confectus, fugere tam repente non poterat. . . . Sic caballo ejectus. . . . Fugimus et omnes cum eo. . . . Allemannorum turbaries tela contra nos mixta toxico jaciebant, minitabantur etiam nos inter aquas natantes piceo igne cremare."—PANDULPH. PISAN.

[1] "Cepit domnum Hugo cardinalis et presbyter papam nostrum in collum . . . die tertio ripæ Terracinensi vivi vix applicavimus."—*Ibid.*

[2] FALCO BENEVENT., ann. 1118; *Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv.; LANDULPH. jun., *Chron.*, c. 32; GERVAIS, i. 182. "*Pacem et minis et terroribus postulavit*," says the pope himself.—Ep. *ad Gall.*, *loc. cit.*

[3] "De controversia quæ inter Ecclesiam et regnum est, vel conventioni

After this declaration, the pope was ordained priest and consecrated at Gaëta, where, among other prelates, he had been joined by the Archbishops of Capua, Benevento, and Salerno, the Abbots of Monte Cassino and La Cava, and the Norman princes, who all swore fidelity to him. Gelasius then gave investiture to Duke William, in the form employed by Gregory VII. for Robert Guiscard, grandfather of the present prince.[1] Meantime, on receiving the pontifical answer, Henry had caused it to be read in the basilica of St. Peter. The cunning monarch was able to avail himself, with the Romans, of the contempt which, he said, was shown for Rome, in fixing the scene of the negotiation at Milan or Cremona.[2]

The emperor was not attended only by soldiers; he had with him also Magister Guarnerius of Bologna,[3] the restorer of the science of Roman law in Italy, and several others of those legists who are always found at the service of oppressors of liberty and of the conscience. The mission of these skilful men generally consisted in making long speeches to the populace in which the ancient canons were interpreted in a sense favourable to a new pontifical election.[4]

The public mind being thus prepared, Henry caused

vel justitiæ libenter acquiescimus . . . fratrum nostrorum judicio qui a Deo sunt judices constituti in Ecclesia, et sine quibus hæc causa tractari non potest."—Ep. *Gelas.*, *loc. cit.*

[1] "Quemadmodum Gregorius papa tradidit illam Roberto Guiscardo avo tuo."—PANDULPH. PISAN., *loc. cit.*, who adds: "Ibi et me Pandulphum ostiarium, qui hæc scripsi, in lectorem et exorcistam promovit."

[2] "Numquid honorem Romæ volunt illi transferre Cremonæ?"—LANDULPH. jun., c. 32; MURAT., v. 502.

[3] This famous man is found forty years later at the diet of Roncaglia, in 1188, where he was one of the four legists who promulgated in favour of Frederic Barbarossa this fine maxim, "*Tua voluntas jus esto: sicuti dicitur, quidquid principi placuit legis habet vigorem.*"—OTHO MORENA, in *Hist. rer. Laudun.*, ap. MURAT., *loc. cit.*, No. 8.

[4] "Magister Guarnerius de Benonia, et plures legis periti, populum Romanum ad eligendum papam convenit, et quidam expeditus lector in pulpito S. Petri per prolixam lectionem decreta pontificum de substituendo papa explicavit."—LANDULPH. jun., *loc. cit.*

Archbishop Maurice Burdin to be proclaimed pope under the name of Gregory VIII.[1] It was he who, as legate, had betrayed Pascal II. But although the election of an intruder was apparently popular, many of the Romans were distressed by a usurpation which seemed to rivet their Church to the imperial rule;[2] and many nobles sent word to the pope that they had taken no part in the crime which had placed an excommunicated man on St. Peter's throne—that the king's criminal artifices would soon be exposed—and that the lawful pontiff, victorious over the malice of the schismatics, would soon be able to return to Rome.[3]

Gelasius hastened to denounce the sacrilegious election of Burdin in letters addressed to the prelates and the faithful of France, the anti-pope's native country; after which, in a council held at Capua, the following Easter, he excommunicated both the emperor and the pope whom the emperor had enthroned.[4]

The council over, Gelasius, following the example of his predecessors, retired to Monte Cassino, the cradle of his religious life, and the citadel of his party. There the monks received him with delight, and he obtained from

[1] March 10, 1118. Gelasius was consecrated at Capua that day or the next. The details of the election are in LANDULPH., c. 32; the people and a small number of clergy shared in it: "*Totus populus . . . quidam de indutis habitu ecclesiastico, . . . cum cæteris astantibus clericis.*" Gelasius, in his letter to the French, says that no member of the Roman clergy took part in the election, and names only the Guibertines or the schismatics.

[2] "Romanorum complures . . . aiebant: heu, miseri, cum nos ex longo nostrorum patrum vetusto ritu, sine alicujus regis adventu et licentia, pastorem eligebamus, quem volebamus, nunc autem sine regis permissu jam amplius alium neque eligere, neque consecrare ausi erimus!"—FALCO BENEVENT., *Chron.* ann. 1118: MURATOR, v. 91.

[3] "Romanorum nobiles . . . nos et nostros amicos consecrationi illius excommunicati viri in pontificem scelestum nullatenus consilii et auxilii manus dedisse. Et sciatis quoniam, Deo opitulante, regis illius, viri iniquissimi machinationes in proximo delebuntur."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Regem ipsum cum idolo suo excommunicavimus."—Ep. *Gelas. ad canon.* in *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 293. It is of the 13th April, and is wanting in this collection of councils.

the Norman princes a promise to prosecute the war with vigour.[1] Meantime it went on languidly on both sides, and the emperor found himself obliged to raise the siege of the castle of Torricella in the Abruzzi, which belonged to the monks of Saint Andrea. This did not prevent the monarch from being crowned by his anti-pope at Whitsuntide, before his return to the north of Italy, where Jordanus, Archbishop of Milan, was carrying on a vigorous resistance.[2]

Gelasius, informed of the emperor's departure, returned secretly to Rome, rather as a pilgrim than as a pontiff,[3] and hid himself in a little church near the palace of Stephen and Pandulph, the two Normans who were of his party.[4] The pope conferred with the orthodox clergy as to the means of reducing the intruder; but having committed the imprudence of going to officiate for the feast of Sta Prassede,[5] in the church of that saint, he was assailed by the Frangipani. In the midst of a bloody combat maintained by Stephen and his nephew Crescenzio Gaëtani in his defence, and in which he was the object struggled for by both sides, he succeeded in escaping, attracting the pity of the women who saw him, half stripped of his sacred ornaments, and flying alone

[1] "Duci et principi Capuano aliisque baronibus dedit firmiter in mandatis, ut omnes contra Barbarum arma compararent."—PANDULPH. PISAN., *loc. cit.*

[2] See above, the council held on this subject at Milan. The church of Ravenna, which had so long been one of the centres of the imperialist schism, and whose archbishop, Guibert, had been anti-pope, returned at this time to orthodoxy, as is shown in the bull of Gelasius, which restores to it the metropolitan rights of which Pascal II. had deprived it at the Council of Guastalla in 1106. "Filii ipsius," says the pope in his bull of September 1, 1118, "delicta patrum corrigere probaverunt, ut qui præteritis temporibus per tyrannidem regiam præsules regibus placentes accipiebant, nunc demum secundum canonicas sanctiones episcopum Deo placentem eligerent, et schismate abdicato, in catholicæ congregationis gremium repedaret."—*Reg. Gelas.*, ii. No. 4.

[3] "Magis ut peregrini quam domini Romam intravimus."—PANDULPH. PISAN, *loc. cit.*

[4] "Quæ S. Maria in secundo cerco dicitur."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Pandulphi nomine;" besides, "et Petrii Latronis Corserum."

through the fields at his horse's utmost speed. The cross-bearer fell while following his master. The pope was found, worn out and weeping, in the open country, near the church of San Paolo fuori le Mura.[1] This was too much; the following day the venerable pontiff announced his intention of following the example of his predecessors and leaving that Rome which he called a Sodom and a Babylon.

"I say it before God and before the Church," he cried, "it would be better to have one emperor than so many; one ill-doer would destroy those more wicked than himself, until the Emperor of emperors should do open judgment upon him."[2]

After having intrusted the different offices of the Church to cardinals in whom he could confide, and constituted Stephen, the Norman hero,[3] gonfalonier of the Roman Church, Gelasius determined to visit France, as Urban II. and Pascal II.[4] had done.

The pope went first to the two towns whose growing power and liberty assured valuable allies to the Church. Having left Rome by water,[5] he disembarked at Pisa, the warlike and faithful city which, obedient to the call of Victor III. and Pascal II., had sent its galleys by turns against the African Saracens and the Mediterranean islanders, and which for thirty years had maintained a perpetual crusade against

[1] "O quanti lamenti matronum quæ papam solum tanquam scuram in campo . . . quantum equus poterat. . . . Nunc crucifer sequitur, cecidit. . . . Papa utrobique quæsitus demum . . . fessus, tristis et ejulans inventus et reductus. Die illa prandium cum cœna fit unum."—PAND. PIS., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Mallem unum imperatorem quam tot: unus saltem nequam perderet nequiores, donec de illo quoque evidentem justitiam imperatorum faceret omnium Imperator."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Princeps et clypeus omnium pariter curialium . . . collaudantibus omnibus, protector et vexillifer in Dei Patris nomine nimis efficaciter ordinatur."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Adeo ut si quis dicat, portum Romanæ Ecclesiæ fluctuantis naviculæ Petri Galliam esse, non mentietur."—BAR., *Ann.*, 1118, c. 14. Suger says: "Ad protectionem serenissimi regis Ludovici, et Gallicanæ Ecclesiæ compassionem, sicut antiquitus consueverunt, confugit."

[5] September 2, 1118.

the enemies of Christ. The holy Father was received with joy by an immense multitude gathered from the fields of Tuscany, to whom he preached with his usual eloquence.[1]

Freed from the agitations of Rome, Gelasius could enjoy the complete liberty of the pontificate,[2] and he made use of it to raise the bishopric of Pisa into a metropolitan see, with extraordinary privileges,[3] and to consecrate, in honour of the glorious and ever-triumphant Virgin, the new cathedral,[4] which the Pisans had just built from the spoils of the Saracens. This cathedral, whose magnificence surpassed that of any building then existing in Italy, is still standing; and the descendants of those who raised it see in it, with pride, a testimony to the splendour of the Italian cities in Catholic times.

From Pisa, the sovereign pontiff went to Genoa, which rivalled the Tuscan city in glory, hardihood, and maritime greatness, and there again he consecrated a cathedral in honour of the blessed martyrs Laurence and Syr.[5] There is nothing more interesting in the general history of the epoch than these relations of the popes with the small municipal republics, whose infant liberties the Church encouraged, at the very time that she was protecting the traditional liberties of the German princes and nobles.

[1] "Coram innumerabilibus turbis Tusciæ."—*Cod. MS.* in UGHELL., *Ital. sacr.*, vol. iii. 434.

[2] "Pro sui officii libertate plenaria tractans."—*Ibid.*

[3] Urban II.'s decree for this purpose had not been executed.—PAGI, *Crit.*, ann. 1118, c. 11. These privileges have been confirmed and perpetuated to our times, when the archbishop and canons of Pisa have a ceremonial and costume almost analogous to that of the pope and cardinals.

[4] September 20, 1118. "In honorem gloriosissimæ semperque triumphatricis Virginis Mariæ."—*Cod. Pis.*, ap. UGHELL., *loc. cit.*

[5] October 10, 1118. See PAGI, *loc. cit.*

CHAPTER XIII

TRIUMPH OF THE SPIRITUAL POWER

Council of Angoulême.—Councils at Dijon, Langres, and Tournus, to which the people flock.—Monks receive Gelasius II. with great liberality.—The decrees of several councils greeted with enthusiasm by the people.—Pope Gelasius at Cluny.—War recommences between the German princes and the emperor.—Henry V., again excommunicated, returns to Germany.—Death of Gelasius II.; election of Calixtus II.—Confirmation, at Rome, of the election of Calixtus.—Council of Toulouse.—General diet at Fribourg; allocution of William de Champeaux.—The emperor swears to respect the treaty with the pope.—The election of Calixtus II. solemnly recognised at Tribur.—Council of Rheims (1119); the five hundred knights of Adalbert of Mayence.—Harangue of Cardinal Conon.—The emperor at Mouzon.—Calixtus II. retires to a castle.—The pope issues a solemn excommunication against the emperor.—The Truce of God again decreed.—Hildegarde, Duchess of Aquitaine, brings before the council her serious complaints against her husband.—Calixtus II. mediates a peace between the Kings of France and England.—The holy Father enthusiastically received in Italy and at Rome.—Calixtus saves the anti-pope Burdin from his captors.

From Geneva, Gelasius turned his steps, as Urban II. and Pascal II. had done, towards that noble country of France, which was then the port where the storm-tossed bark of St. Peter ever found a safe harbour.

The general state of this kingdom was then most satisfactory. The troubles caused in a small number of the northern towns by the institution of communes, the enterprises of King Louis le Gros against his great vassals—enterprises in which the new communes, led to battle by abbots and bishops, brought efficacious support to royalty[1]

[1] Order. Vital., b. xi. p. 836.

—even the war of Louis of France with the King of England, and his defeat at Brenneville, in spite of the widespread fame it had had,[1] had done no serious hurt to the liberty or salutary activity of the Church. But she was mourning a most heavy loss, that of Yves of Chartres,[2] one of the great lights of the French clergy, the friend of Pascal II., and united by many ties of sympathy to Gelasius. He had been quickly followed to the tomb by his friend and faithful counsellor, Robert d'Arbrissel,[3] founder of Fontevrault, and by Bernard of Tiron.[4] These two rivals in active holiness and sublime austerity devoted their last efforts to the maintenance of freedom in ecclesiastical elections, endangered on the occasion of giving a successor to Yves of Chartres.[5] The object of Robert's last prayer was to obtain from God His support for the pope and the doctors of the Holy Church, that they might keep the good way to the end.[6] In the same year as these three great saints, France lost a fourth, Anselm, called the *doctor of doctors*, whose father was a ploughman.[7] Anselm for forty

[1] "Quod longe lateque divulgatum est, et per omnes provincias cis Alpes a lugentibus sive subsannantibus passim diffusum est."—ORD. VIT., b. xii. p. 855.

[2] In January 1117, after a pontificate of twenty-seven years, a date carefully fixed by Pagi. St. Pius V. authorised his worship by the order of regular canons in 1570.

[3] February 21 or 25, 1117.

[4] April 25, 1117. Bernard had trained five hundred monks, three hundred of whom he kept at Tiron, sending the two hundred others to different places to live, twelve in each house, which he visited from time to time. Robert had collected more than three thousand disciples of both sexes at Fontevrault.

[5] FLEURY, b. lxvi. c. 33 and 34. Count Thibault of Blois and Chartres would not at first recognise the election made by the canons, and seized the property of some of them; he resisted the persuasions of Bernard, but yielded to Robert.

[6] "Omnibus egressis, cœpit humiliter rogitare, ut pro sua pietate Romanum papam et omnes doctores suæ Ecclesiæ, in proposito sanctæ religionis dignetur usque ad finem servare."—ACT. SS. BOLLAND., vol. ii., Febr., p. 615.

[7] Petri cantoris verbum abbreviatum, 1639, c. 47.

years had gathered round his chair, first at Paris, and afterwards at Laon, a crowd of illustrious pupils from all countries of Christendom.[1] In the little town of Laon he had established a true university, frequented by the youth of every country in Europe.

France, in spite of these cruel losses, still possessed a number of eminent men: Hildebert, Bishop of Le Mans; Geoffrey, Abbot of Vendôme; Joceran, Archbishop of Lyons; and many other zealous prelates and learned doctors, in the front rank of whom appeared the two legates, Gerard of Angoulême and Guy of Vienne, who, during the last years of Pascal II., had continued to fill with advantage to liberty, ecclesiastical discipline, justice, and the equality of laws, the glorious mission confided to them. Gerard was obliged to humble Count Conon of Bretagne, who, after having robbed the monks of Quimperlé of a gift made by his ancestors,[2] tried to prevent them from appealing to the Holy See. Gerard obtained his object in a council called at Angoulême,[3] and which was preceded by a lively correspondence,

[1] July 15, 1117. He trained many prelates for all countries: in Italy,—Odalric and Anselm, both Archbishops of Milan: in Belgium,—Franco Abbot of Lobbe; Jean, Abbot of St. Amand; Philippe, Abbot of Bonne-Espérance; Wibald, Abbot of Stevelot; Bernard, Bishop of Utrecht: in England,—William and Ralph, Archbishops of Canterbury; the Bishops of Hereford, Rochester, and London, and Abbot Gilbert of Sempringham, founder of the order which bears his name: in Germany,—the B. Dittmar, schoolmaster of Bremen; Idunge of Ratisbon, a celebrated writer; B, Wecelin of Oldenburg, and Apostle of Holstein: in France,—Raoul, his brother and successor as teacher at Laon; St. Bruno, Mathieu of Laon, Cardinal-bishop of Albano; Hugh Melet, Abbot of St. Léon of Toul; Gilbert de la Porrée, and William de Champeaux; Raoul Levert, Archbishop of Rheims; Geoffrey le Breton and Hugh d'Amiens, Archbishops of Rouen; Bishops of Coutances and Le Mans: and, finally, Abélard (who speaks ill of them),—were all trained in the schools of Anselm.—*Hist. litt. de France*, vol. x. 173, and DEVISME, *Hist. de Laon*, vol. i. p. 231. This enumeration, though very incomplete, shows the unity and activity of intellectual culture in the twelfth century.

[2] It referred to Belle Isle en Mer, which the Abbot of Redon had usurped.

[3] At Lent, 1118. "Adversus pullulantia vitia et enormitates in Ecclesia et populo Dei emergentes," he says in his letters of convocation.

in which he said to the Count: "We have heard that you love justice and peace, and we are glad of it, for it is thus that good princes purchase for themselves the favour of the supreme King; but if you hinder your subjects from having recourse to the justice of the Roman Church, which no other king or prince dares to do, you, whose ancestors have held the principality of Bretagne under the authority of the Vicar of St. Peter,[1] be assured that the sentence of that holy Church and the sword of St. Peter shall smite both you and your principality."[2]

While Gerard of Angoulême was exercising his legation in the West, his co-legate, Guy of Burgundy, Archbishop of Vienne, was, on his side, holding councils at Tournus, Dijon, and Langres, to regulate the laws and terminate the disputes submitted to him. It was not only bishops and abbots, or the nobility, who were present at these assemblies; the people resorted there eagerly, and in crowds, for they were always public.[3] In these deliberations, where the most various complaints and accusations were heard, where injuries done to the poor were repaired, and the pride of the powerful was punished, Christian people shared in the regulation of matters affecting their dearest interests. These assemblies replaced the *pleadings of God* of the ancient Franks. The crowd at them was so great, that at the council of Luz, between Langres

[1] "Sicut in scripturis reperitur, a Vicario B. Petri principatum tenuisse manifestum sit."

[2] "Noveritis pro certo S. R. Ecclesiæ sententiam et gladium B. Petri vobis et principatui vestro imminere."—*Annal. Bened.*, vol. vi. app. No. 2. Pascal II. had written to Count Conon on the same subject, as follows: "Nosse debes, fili carissime, quia non est potestas nisi a Deo. Per ipsum igitur potestate accepta, noli adversus eum cervicem cordis erigere, nec ejus Ecclesiam impugnare, sed potius ejus omnipotentiam cogita, et humiliter Ecclesiæ præcepta custodi, ut qui magna suscepisti, majora merearis suscipere."—*Ibid.*

[3] Nearly all the decrees of the councils are rendered "*Approbante immensa clericorum et laicorum multitudine.*" See *Collect. Concil.*, *passim.* The publicity of these deliberations is proved by the details of the councils of Poitiers, Rockingham, and others of which we have not been able to speak.

and Bèze, held by the legate Guy,[1] it was necessary, in order to lodge the innumerable multitude that came thither, to pitch a camp with tents and huts made of boughs, in the middle of which were placed in gold and silver shrines the relics of various saints. Before these sacred remains the council judged the causes of the many pleaders who had injuries to complain of, and decided them to the great satisfaction of the crowd.[2]

These assemblies seldom separated without having taken some general measures for the protection of the country people, such as the renewal of the Truce of God, or the interdiction, under pain of anathema, of the burning of cottages, and the theft of sheep and lambs during the time of war.[3]

The active, powerful, and continuous interference of apostolic legates must necessarily have kept up in the provinces sentiments of fidelity and attachment to the Roman Church.[4] Thus when Pope Gelasius landed in France he was received by the prelates, the nobles, and the people with the most affectionate demonstrations of respect and joy.[5] All disputed with each other the right of relieving

[1] July 8, 1116.

[2] "Adfuit nobilium populique fere innumerabilis multitudo, erectis in quamdam speciem castrorum hic illic papillionibus, de ramis arborum tectis viridantibus, dipositisque sub amplissimo tentorio, veluti portabili templo, diversorum sanctorum capsis. . . . Id genus comitiorum placitum Dei . . . dixere majores. Agitata ibi permulta de damnis et injuriis multorum: multa definita, nonnulla rejecta vel compressa . . . absque graviore casu . . . immo plurimorum solatio finitus conventus." —VIGNERII, *Chron. Lingon.*, veter. instrument. fide context., ap. COLET., *Concil.*, xii. 1234.

[3] "Ibi" (at Troyes in 1107), "decretum, ut per nullam guerram incendia domorum fierent, nec oves aut agni raperentur."—*Chron. Malleac.*, ann. 1107; LABBE, *Bibl. nov. MS.*

[4] Baluze and Pagi, however (*Crit.*, in ann. 1120, c. 7), think that Gerard of Angoulême, always faithful to Pascal II. and afterwards to Calixtus II., did not acknowledge Gelasius II.; but the proofs they give seem quite insufficient.

[5] "Excitati sunt quique potentes cum mediocribus, ei occurrere."—EADM., *Hist. nov.*, b. v. "Illuc omnes episcopi, abbates et monachi, nobiles et ignobiles, cujuscumque ordinis pari modo conveniunt, quique

the noble poverty and sufferings of the pontiff. Gelasius arrived, much indisposed after his sea voyage, deprived of everything, and in a state almost of beggary,[1] thus adding the privations of poverty to the outrages, violence, dangers, and fatigues of exile—in a word, to all those trials which, ever since the beginning of his pontificate, had crowned his white hairs with all the merits which could be desired by the vicar of a crucified God.

The monks chiefly reaped the honour of supplying the needs of the head of the Church—a monk like themselves. The pope was first lodged at the abbey of St. Gilles, where he received the most liberal hospitality.[2] Abbot Pons of Cluny, to whom as to a specially beloved son of the Roman Church he had sent news of his coming by a courier from Pisa, hurried to meet the pontiff and escort him to the domains of his father, the Count of Melgueil, where he loaded him with presents, and took care of him until the august old man had recovered from his fatigues.[3] There Norbert, the young German noble, once chaplain to the emperor, whom we have seen venturing at the time of Pascal's arrest to protest against the conduct of his master and his countrymen by

suo modulo ei servire parati."—PAND. PIS., *loc. cit.* "Archiepiscopi omnes, et episcopi, proceresque alii gaudio cum ineffabili et honore immenso eum susceperunt."—FALC., *Benev. Chron.*, *loc. cit.* "Pauperie quippe multa angebatur."—SUGER, *De vit. Ludov. Gross.*, c. 21. "Pro maris molestia infirmatum."—*Biblioth. Cluniac.*, p. 559.

[1] According to Suger, at Maguelonne, and according to his companion Pandulph, at St. Gilles, a league away from the Rhone, and a long way from its mouth; but according to the Chronicle of Maurigny, at Marseilles (which is confirmed by the diploma dated thence, October 26, 1118).—*Ann. Bened.*, b. lxxiii. c. 32.

[2] "Quam bene, quam largissime ab eis fuerit diutius pertractatus, satis manifestum est."—PAND. PISAN., *loc. cit.*

[3] "Cursore e Pisis emisso . . . proprium et specialem filium . . . Equitaturas et alia quam maxima elegantissime ministrasti . . . in tuæ solo nativitatis, quod pater tuus Petrus potens et nobilis comes Mergulensis juri apostolorum Petri et Pauli contradidit et inde accepit, ut papam officiosissime confovisti . . . qui denuo convalescens. . . ."—*Bibl. Cluniac.*, *loc. cit.*

rendering public homage to the victim, came barefoot in the midst of winter to seek Gelasius, and demand his permission to preach the Word of God wherever he would; and thus the future archbishop, the founder of a great new order, the generous young man whose vocation had been made known to him at the feet of a captive pope, now received from an exiled pope his express commission.[1]

Thither also came a monk destined, like Norbert, to great celebrity—the monk Suger, from the abbey of St. Denis, who had been charged by King Louis of France to offer to the holy Father the first-fruits, as it were, of his kingdom,[2] and to arrange with him for an interview at the abbey of Vézelay.

The Abbot of Cluny gave the pope thirty horses; the Abbot Catalan of St. Concordio added ten,[3] and with this *cortège* Gelasius started on his journey through the country. But before travelling northwards, the sovereign pontiff had the consolation of receiving the homage of a nation ever admirably Christian, who for four centuries had preserved, through a perpetual struggle with the infidels, an inviolable and ardent attachment to the Church. While the kings and heroes of Spain were gradually pushing forward the frontier of territories won from the Moors and Arabs at the sword's point, behind them bishops and monks, who had already borne a brilliant part in these combats, were founding and consolidating social order and Christian law in the bosom of the conquered country. The admirable results of a series of councils whose decrees the whole nobility eagerly sanctioned, bear the impression both of the most Catholic zeal and of that truly brotherly care for the poorer classes which has done honour to Catholic Spain. At Valencia, in 1114, the Fathers in council found it neces-

[1] HUGO, *Vit. S. Norbert.*, ap. BOLLAND., *Act. SS.* Junii, vi. p. 821. From a passage in the *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1118, Norbert then passed for a Benedictine convert, "*noster conversus in peregrino habitu.*"

[2] "Quia regni primitias obtuleramus."—SUGER, *loc. cit.*

[3] PANDULPH. PISAN., *loc. cit.*; *Ann. Bened.*, b. lxxiii. c. 32.

sary to provide for the restitution of property usurped during the civil wars.[1] At Compostella they decided that when a poor man had to plead against a rich man, the latter should be obliged to send an inferior[2] to represent him, in order, says the decree, that no respect of persons may interfere with the justice due to the poor man.[3]

Just as the French prelates, at the Council of Troyes, had watched over the peasants' flocks, so the Castilian bishops and nobles at Oviedo, after having affirmed the right of sanctuary in churches, forbade all Christians, under pain of excommunication and exile, to seize or detain the plough-oxen, even when they belonged to their own serfs or servants;[4] and these decrees, rendered by fifteen bishops, sixteen counts, and two hundred and sixty-three barons, were greeted by the people as inspirations of God Himself; and the Jews and Mussulmans admired them as much as the Christians.[5] During this time Alfonso the Warrior was fighting the infidels with that indefatigable perseverance to which he owed his surname,[6] and was tearing from them bit by bit the kingdom of Arragon.[7] He and his com-

[1] "Incipiunt decreta D. Didaci Compostellani episcopi ad protegendos pauperes . . . canonicorum, judicum, cæterorumque nobilium virorum consilio."—Ap. COLETT., *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1205. See the long list of signatures given by the nobility of Galicia at the Council of Oviedo.—*Ibid.*, pp. 1216–1219.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1202–1206.

[3] "Pauperes et imbecilles misericorditer calumnias compleant, ut beneficiis suis penitus non priventur. . . ."—*Decret.* xi. "Si quis potentum judicii causam tractare adversus pauperem vel definire habuerit, similem personam introducat, quæ pro se causam suam definiat: ne forte cujuspiam majestate pauperis justitia suffocetur."—*Ibid.*, 1206, 1207.

[4] "Omnium sanctæ crucis filiorum . . . ut vestrum nullus deinceps domitos vel indomitos pro aliqua causa pignoret boves, nec auferat alicui extraneo, vel suo servo, vel mandatitio. Quod si fecerit, sit maledictus, et excommunicatus," &c.—*Ibid.*, 1216.

[5] "Constitutio hæc non hominis, sed omnipotentis Dei vox fuit . . . et audita placuit . . . tam Christianis quam paganis vel Judæis."— *Ibid.*, p. 1219. Cf. SANDOVAL, *Vit. Urrac.*, ap. PAGI, ann. 1115, c. 17.

[6] He is said to have fought twenty-nine battles during his reign.

[7] Huesca and Tudela were taken, in 1114, with the help of Rotrou, Count

panions, who had been besieging Saragossa in vain for six months, thought they might take heaven by force by sending ambassadors to the exiled and persecuted pope to beg from him a special benediction, and the consecration of a bishop for a town which they expected soon to snatch from the infidels. Gelasius consecrated the bishop, and granted pontifical indulgence to all who should perish in this holy war. The bull was addressed to all the army encamped before Saragossa,[1] and was dictated at Alais on the eve of the very day [2] when the besieged city, after having for four hundred years groaned beneath the yoke of the Arabs, yielded to the swords of the heroes,[3] and by its fate brought about the enfranchisement of all Arragon. Gelasius seemed so touched by the devotion of the Spaniards to the cause of Christ, that a report was spread in France that he thought of crossing the Pyrenees.[4] But this was a mistake. After having convoked the bishops of France and Germany at a council which was to be held at Rheims in the spring of the year 1119, the holy Father travelled by Puy, Lyons, and Mâcon to Cluny, the great French abbey, which, like Monte Cassino in Italy, was considered as the fortress and natural refuge of the papacy. Gelasius there received a hospitality worthy of the first of transalpine monasteries, and saw offerings flow in from the prelates and most of the nobles of the

of Perche, and other Normans.—ORDER. VIT., b. xiii.; PAGI, *Crit.* in BARON., ann. 1114, c. 15.

[1] "Gelasius ep. serv. serv. Dei exercitui Christianorum civitatem Cæsaraugustanam obsidenti . . . et quoniam et vos ipsos et vestra extremis objicere periculis decrevistis, si quis vestrum, accepta de peccatis suis pœnitentia in expeditione hac mortuus fuerit, nos cum S.S. meritis et totius Ecclesiæ catholicæ precibus e suorum vinculis peccatorum absolvimus."—Ep. vi. ap. BARON., and COLETTI.

[2] December 10, 1118. See for comparison and fixing of dates, PAGI, *Crit.* in BARON., ann. 1118, *loc. cit.*

[3] "Divina favente clementia vestris precibus et fortium virorum audacia. . . ."—Ep. *Petr. Cæsaraugust. episcop. encyclica.*, *ibid.*

[4] "Accepit a quibusdam papam longius discessisse et versus Hispanias ire proposuisse."—EADM., *Hist. nov.*, b. v.

country.[1] The two great ecclesiastical personages of the time, the Archbishop of Vienne and Conon of Palestrina, found themselves together there, one having been sent for by the pope,[2] and the other having spontaneously hastened to visit him, although in Germany as well as in France the indefatigable champion of the Church had had to maintain contests, often successful, but always vigorous, against an enemy whose submission was never more than apparent. Cardinal Conon had very lately distinguished himself in the neighbourhood of Metz, by prodigies of skill, courage, and activity. This diocese had for a long time been oppressed and dishonoured by the lawlessness of Albéron, a relation of the emperor,[3] who had finally usurped the episcopal authority, which was disputed only by a courageous archdeacon named Alberius. Naturally, the usurper triumphed, and the archdeacon, upon whose head the emperor had set a price, was obliged to go in the midst of a thousand dangers to seek refuge at Rome. There the pope, being well informed of all that had happened, gave Cardinal Conon orders to return across the Alps as legate, and remedy this state of affairs. Conon succeeded in safely crossing the Alps, deceived the vigilance of the imperial satellites, and, disguised as a public writer, travelled, with the implements of his trade hung from his shoulder, as far as the city of Rheims.[4] There he made himself known, summoned a council, and proclaimed Albéron's deposition. Without losing a moment, the legate then hurried to seek, in a

[1] "In quo juxta loci potentiam . . . et receptus est pariter et benigne tractatus. . . . Sed et reges et principes tanquam si Petrum viserint, tam per se, quam per nuntios eum non parvis muneribus sedulo frequentabant."—PAND. PIS., *loc. cit.* The *Chron. Ursperg.* and FLEURY speak of a council held by Gelasius at Vienne; but PAGI proves that he never held one there.—Ann. 1119, c. 1, 2.

[2] Ep. *Calixt. in Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1119.

[3] "Imperiali prosapia, sed moribus, longe ignobilis."—*Ann. Bened.*, b. lxxiii., No. 5.

[4] "Scriptoris assumpto habitu, cujus artis instrumenta ex humeris pendentia gerebat."—*Ibid.*

deserted corner of the diocese, a pious abbot, named Theotger, whom he caused to be elected bishop. This Theotger, who came from the Black Forest, was of ignoble origin; he was son and grandson of priests, but himself renowned for the greatest virtue. In vain did the humble monk insist upon the stain on his birth as a reason for declining the episcopate; Conon used his authority, and forced him to accept under pain of excommunication. The legate would not suffer, as we have already seen in the case of St. Godefroy of Amiens, that a monk should prefer the sweetness of solitude to the burden of a bishopric. "We command you," he wrote to Theotger, "to accept, without resistance, the difficult task of governing the church of Metz. Stand like a wall before the house of Israel, and prepare to defend the Church of Christ against the unchained fury of the waves which threaten her, following the example of those pastors of former days who did not fear to expose themselves to death for her protection."[1]

This affair concluded,[2] Conon, whose energy never failed, and who possessed an iron constitution, went to the Rhine to rejoin the princes allied for the defence of the Church and their own liberties. These were too skilful not to have profited by the emperor's long stay in Italy. On the other side, Frederic of Hohenstaufen, the emperor's nephew and lieutenant, was not, in spite of his great valour, strong enough to struggle successfully against the formidable alliance of secular and ecclesiastical princes, which was

[1] "Commonemus et præcipimus quatenus injunctum tibi onus . . . subire non subterfugias . . . et Ecclesiam Christi inter flantes et immanissima rabie fluctuantes procellas nutantem," &c.—NOUGART., *Cod. diplom. Aleman.*, vol. ii. No. 83. In a second letter, Conon redoubled his threats, but permitted Theotger to retain the direction of his abbey until a suitable successor should be found.

[2] The nomination of Theotger was solemnly proclaimed at the Council of Cologne in May 1118; but the imperialists, who were masters of Metz, closed its gates against him. He accompanied Calixtus II. to the Council of Rheims, in 1119, then to Auxerre and Cluny, where he remained four months, and where he died in 1120.—TRITH., *Chron. Hirsaug.*, ann. 1087.

guided by Duke Lothaire and the two archbishops, Adalbert of Mayence and Frederic of Cologne. These powerful personages had just been joined by the Archbishop of Magdeburg and by Conrad of Salzburg, recently emerged from the retreat where he had been obliged to hide himself after his bold protest against the pope's imprisonment in 1111.[1]

The war, however, was continued from 1116 to 1117, with an animosity which caused fearful ravages among churches and monasteries.[2] Conrad of Hohenstaufen, the new Duke of Franconia, brother of Duke Frederic of Suabia, distinguished himself above all by the violent means which he used to establish his authority in the province granted to him.

Besides these two princes, his nephews, Henry had few open partisans except the Count-Palatine Godefroy, and a few bishops,[3] such as Hartwig of Ratisbon, who, with base servility, sent word to the emperor that he might count upon him not only as a bishop, but as ready in all things to do a servant's duty.[4] Unlike the independent populations of the

[1] See above.

[2] *Annal Sax.*, 1116, 1117. We must refer for details of the battles and negotiations of these two years to the learned work of Gervais (*Hist. of Henry V.*, vol. i. sect. 5), in which this epoch of German history is examined and ascertained.

[3] GERVAIS, i. p. 228, No. 1, enumerates them. Duke Welf of Bavaria seems to have remained neutral during the period of the contest. The chapters of Spire, Würzburg, and Bamberg had an imperialist majority; the holy bishop Otho of Bamberg, placed in the midst of Franconia, where the emperor's nephew ruled, used a reserve which excited the lively indignation of the primate Adalbert, whom, at the commencement of the revolt, he had consecrated.—See *Cod. Udalr.*, Nos. 284, 285, 286, 289, 290, 291.

[4] "Domino suo Romano Imper. Aug. Henrico suus omnimodo B. non episcopale, sed servile obsequium in omnibus."—*Cod. Udalr.*, No. 280. This initial B. indicates one of the following bishops: Burkhard of Halberstadt († 1118), Bruno of Spire, vice-chancellor till 1116; Bruno of Strasburg, vice-chancellor till 1123; or Burkhard of Bâle, to whom Henry had given the abbey of Pfeffen. From the following passage,—"Ubicumque possum in villis, civitatibus et oppidis fautores vobis adquero, ita ut nuper meo labore et consilio conjuraverint omnes a Wermatia usque ad Argentinam vobis terram illam et omnes homines retinere atque tueri,"—we may

small republics of Italy, the citizens of most of the towns, especially in the valley of the Upper Rhine from Bâle to Mayence, were devoted to Henry's cause, as they had been to his father's. But, on the other hand, most of the nobles were fighting for the Church and for freedom.[1]

Under the guidance of Duke Lothaire and Archbishop Adalbert, who succeeded in vanquishing and restraining the different cities, the monks, on their part, formed as ever a permanent centre of opposition to the imperialists. At Limburg the very lives of the monks were threatened.[2] Those of the two imperial abbeys of Lorsch and Fulda[3] revolted against the abbots whom the emperor, in spite of their earnest protests, had imposed upon them.[4]

Tidings of the election of the anti-pope, Gregory VIII., and the revival of the schism in the spring of 1118, served only to heighten the zeal of the Catholic party; and the arrival of the legate Conon in Lorraine inspired it with fresh activity.

suppose that he was a bishop of the Rhine valley, and understand how important it was to the imperialists to gain partisans in the cities.

[1] LÜDEN, vol. ix. b. xx. c. 8, p. 478.

[2] When the imperialist garrison of this Alsatian town, built round the great abbey, and besieged by Lothaire, were suffering from want, a Suabian knight, Ulric of Norningen, declared that, before giving up the place, they ought to eat up the monks, who were very fat: "Melius fore ut pingues monachi ederantur quam castrum propter ciborum inopiam hostibus traderentur."—OTTO FRISING., *De. Gest. Frid.*, vol. i. b. i. c. 14. This threat forced the monks to produce the stores of provisions which they had tried to keep from the enemies of the Church.

[3] There were in the empire four great abbeys called *imperial*, whose abbots were chaplains to the emperor, bound to attend him to his coronation at Rome, and to war, and in the diet were seated at his feet as referees; these abbeys were Fulda, Hersfeld, Wissemburg, and Lorsch. Later, Corvey, Kempten, and Murbach had the same rank. They formed a class superior to the "*regalia monasteria, quæ jura feudalia sive regalia tenebant ab imperio Romano, et ad communia regni obsequia per vices obligata erant.*"—TRITHEM., *Chron. Hirsaug.*, ann. 1114. The third class comprised all monasteries which were neither imperial nor royal.

[4] The imperialist Abbot of Lorsch was vigorously opposed and finally expelled by Count Berchthold, attorney of the monastery.—GERVAIS, i. 224.

In a council held at Cologne,[1] Conon again published the emperor's excommunication, with that of his nephews Frederic and Conrad, the Count-Palatine and his chief adherents.[2] As only the princes and prelates of Lower Germany could be present at this council, Conon and Adalbert called another at Fritzlar in Hesse,[3] where the sentence was renewed. There the princes decreed that a general assembly should be held at Würzburg; that the emperor should be summoned thither to defend himself; and that they should proceed to his deposition if he refused to appear at the appointed day.[4]

On hearing of this threatening resolution, Henry perceived that it was absolutely necessary to renounce the secondary affairs which kept him in Italy. He therefore left the empress there with a German army, and crossing the Alps, appeared suddenly on the banks of the Rhine in November 1118.[5]

The war immediately recommenced with fresh fury.

The legate Conon had not waited for the emperor's arrival; hurrying with the speed of lightning[6] wherever

[1] May 19, 1118. [2] *Chron. Ursperg.*, 1119; *Cod. Udalr.*, 291.

[3] July 26, 1118. These dates are skilfully decided by Stentzel (vol. ii. p. 329), who has rectified the error fallen into by Pagi, and most historians, in placing these councils in 1119.

[4] Gervais (vol. i. p. 248) thinks that this latter decree was not really passed, but that the rumour of it was sufficient to bring back the emperor. The *Chron. Ursperg.* says: "*Alteram quoque synodum in Frileslar eadem pro causa indixit Chuno, qua et habita, eadem quam prius excommunicationem confirmavit. Imperator, his auditis, insuper etiam quod principum consensus generale vel curiale colloquium non multo post apud Wiurtziburg instituere proposuisset, ubi ipse aut præsens ad audientiam exhiberi aut absens regno deponi.*"—*Ann.*, 1119. Gervais also thinks that the lay princes allied against Henry separated themselves at this period from the prelates, and that an agreement took place between them and the leaders of the imperial party; but he gives no authority for this double supposition.

[5] "Efferatus animo . . . se nimis insperatus exhibuit."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, *loc. cit.*

[6] "Qui instar fulgoris coruscantis abiens et rediens."—BARON., ann. 1118, c. 20.

the needs of the Church called him, on the 5th November he was at Rouen, where he found assembled in council King Henry of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Norman bishops and abbots. The cardinal described to them, with the lively eloquence common to him, the troubles of the Church, the usurpation of Burdin, and the shameful persecution by the emperor of Gelasius II. and the orthodox Catholics. He announced to them the true pope's speedy arrival in France, and summoned the Church of Normandy to aid the exiled pontiff by prayers, and, above all, by subsidies.[1] It does not appear that Henry of England thought fit to offer any obstacle to what was preparing for his son-in-law. As to the French bishops, they emulated each other in desiring to support the sovereign pontiff. Conon was encouraged by the noble Hildebert: the holy Bishop of Le Mans called him the representative of the Holy See "in the East as well as in the West;" he exhorted him to remain, as he had hitherto done, steadfast in his intrepidity, in braving all dangers, in remaining disinterested amidst all kinds of seductions and offers of gain, which, happily, could never "tarnish the gold of such a conscience." "You are," said the great bishop, "one of those to whom Satan will often come and say, *I will give thee all thou wilt, if thou wilt bow down and worship me;* but I know you well—you are also of those who will always reply to the tempter, '*Get thee behind me, Satan.*'"[2]

[1] "Eloquentissimo sermone utpote latiali fonte a pueritia inebriatus, querimoniam fecit de imperatore . . . catholicorum diro persecutore . . . de multimodo in Tusciæ partibus Ecclesiæ tribulatione . . . subsidium petiit orationum magisque pecuniarum."—ORDER. VITAL., b. xii. p. 826. See for dates, PAGI, ann. 1118, c. 14.

[2] "Prænestino Episcopo C. card. et summi pontificis per Orientem et Occidentem legato. . . . Ecclesiæ negotia quæ pariter inter minas intrepidus, et integer inter munera capitis discrimine peregisti. . . . Perseveres, oro, nec patiaris ut illud purissimum conscientiæ tuæ argentum cujuslibet muneris scoria decoloret. Venturus est Sathanas . . . sed si bene novi te . . ." &c.—Ep. HILDEB., vol. ii. No. 16, ed. Beaugend., p.

From Rouen, Conon hurried to join Pope Gelasius at Cluny; but the two former rivals had little time to enjoy their union, and to mingle their zeal for the Church's defence. The pope now emulated Conon in resolution, and meditated great designs for continuing the contest;[1] but, worn out by age, by infirmities, and by the fatigue of so long a journey, he was attacked by a mortal disease.[2] In the midst of the great monastery of Cluny, now his asylum, all things reminded him that he was a monk;[3] and he chose to die like a monk, laid upon the ground on a bed of ashes.[4]

It was around this deathbed that the dying man called the cardinals who had accompanied him and pointed out to them as his successor the legate Conon, who, since Pascal's fall, had directed the Church's opposition to the empire. In these circumstances, the Cardinal of Palestrina showed the greatness, the humility, and the disinterestedness which filled his heart, mingled with that indomitable courage and firmness of which he had given so many proofs. Interrupting the dying pontiff, Conon exclaimed, "God forbid, holy Father, that so great an honour and so heavy a burden should be laid upon me, unworthy and miserable as I am! The Roman Church in our days needs to be defended against persecution by temporal riches and influence. If you would take my advice, it would be to elect the Arch-

99. The date of this letter is uncertain; the title might refer to the time when Conon returned from the East (in 1114). We have thought, however, that it might belong to the time when Conon, being at Rouen, was nearest to Hildebert of Le Mans.

[1] "Multa novis sæculis nova et inaudita proponentem facturum."—EADM., *Hist. Nov.*, b. v. p. 95.

[2] "Subita passione, quam Græci pleuresim vocant."—PANDULPH. PISAN., ap. BARON., 1119.

[3] "In propria domo proprius pastor."—*Bibl. Chron.*, p. 55.

[4] "Juxta normam monasticam strato terræ corpusculo."—PANDULPH., *loc. cit.*

. . . . . "Cluniacensi
Dormiit in proprio Romani juris asylo."
—PETR. PICTAV., Ep. GELAS., ap. BARON., *loc. cit.*

bishop of Vienne, a man both religious and prudent, and, moreover, possessed of worldly rank and power. By God's help and the merits of St. Peter he may be able to deliver the Roman Church, so long oppressed and threatened, and to lead her to peace and victory."[1]

The pope and cardinals accepted this proposal: they sent, instantly, to seek the archbishop in his diocese; but before he could arrive, Gelasius had breathed his last,[2] after a pontificate of less than a year. During this short period, Gelasius II. had, as all his contemporaries said, suffered more than any of his predecessors since the age of the martyrs; conflict, insults, violence, blows, exile, poverty, nothing had been wanting to him of all which constitutes, for a vicar of Jesus Christ, the glorious dower of trial and suffering.

The monks of Cluny buried the pope-monk, thus dead in exile, in their great new church, beside the famous and holy brethren who had founded the power of the illustrious abbey, and among whom Gelasius, pope and confessor of the faith, was so well worthy of a place.[3] Nothing more was

[1] "Absit, omnino absit ut tanti honoris culmen, onerisque pondus indignus ego et infelix suscipiam! . . . Viennensem Archiep., virum utique religiosum, prudentisque animi, potentia et nobilitate sæculari pollentem, ornatum virtutibus . . . eligamus. . . . Sub tantæ persecutionis periculo diutissime oppressam, credimus ad serenitatem atque triumphum sublevandam." — FALCO BENEVENT., *Chron.*, ann. 1119, ap. BARON. and MURAT., vol. v.

[2] January 29, 1119.

[3] "Hic igitur positus dilectos inter alumnos
Cum patribus sanctis requiescit.
Felix inde nimis semper Cluniace manebis
Quod pater orbis Apostolicus summusque sacerdos
Ecclesiæ, matris tuæ specialis, apud te
Transiit ad superos, in te requiescit humatus.
Nec minus hic etiam felicem credimus illum
Cui dedit ipse pius magno pro munere Christus,
Ut monachi monachum, Patrem quoque pignora chara
Jugiter aspicerent, lacrymisque rigando sepulchrum
Sacris in precibus specialem semper haberent."
—PETR. PICTAVIENS., Ep. GELAS. II.

wanting to the glory of Cluny, now become the burial-place of a sovereign pontiff, and the destined scene of his successor's election. The Archbishop of Vienne on his way thither heard of the death of Gelasius, but continued his journey in order to be present at the pontifical funeral.[1] On the day after his arrival, Guy of Burgundy was, in spite of his resistance, elected pope by the cardinals. The election was enthusiastically confirmed by the bishops, and by several hundred clerks and nobles who were present.[2] Guy took the name of Calixtus II., but would not assume the red cope until the cardinals at Rome, to whom he instantly sent word of the election, should have confirmed it.[3]

Guy of Burgundy, though elected by the influence of the great monastery of Cluny, did not, like Gregory VII., Urban II., and Pascal II.,[4] belong to a monastic order; he was the first pope, since the accession of Hildebrand, who had not been a monk.[5] But his turn of mind, his manner of life, and his austerity of morals were those of the cloister. The devoted friend and defender of monasteries, the Archbishop of Vienne passed all the time he could spare from his episcopal duties at the abbey of Bonnevau,[6] which he had founded, and from which he could hardly be torn. God also granted to him the great honour of introducing into

[1] "Ego ut fratribus qui cum domino eo venerant, prout ratio exigebat, solatium exhiberem, Cluniacum cum gravi dolore perrexi. . . . Episcopi, cardinales, et centum clerici et laici Romanorum, invitum me penitusque renitentem. . . ."—Ep. CALIXT., i. *in Concil.*

[2] "Qui se indignum iterato reclamans, idcirco omnibus modis resistebat, quia et incertum habebatur a mutis utrum Romæ factum hujusmodi teneretur. Propter quod vix cappa rubea amiciri sustinuit, donec. . . ." —PANDULPH. PISAN., *loc. cit.*

[3] Born at Quingey, in Franche-Comté.

[4] Some authors think that he also was of the Benedictine order, but there is no proof of this. D. H. Ménard has, however, put him in the Benedictine martyrology.

[5] Victor III. and Gelasius II. were monks of Monte Cassino.

[6] "Ex Bonævallis cœnobio raptum . . . inter monachos continuo conversantem atque æmulantem eorum exercitio."—MANRIQUE, *Ann. Cisterciences*, vol. i. p. 101.

the Church a new religious order, destined to eclipse by its splendour all to which monastic genius had hitherto given birth.

Far from considering the successor of Gelasius II. as having degenerated from the austere fervour of his predecessors, the cardinals, in placing him upon the pontifical throne, desired to recompense the ardent courage and disinterested devotion which had made him the first in Europe to pronounce the anathema against his own near relative, the Emperor Henry V. Since then, the Archbishop of Vienne had always fought in the foremost rank, to maintain the true faith and the independence of the Church. It was owing to him that France, and especially the two Burgundys, had remained untouched by the evil spirit which had triumphed over the papacy at Rome. The high birth of Guy of Burgundy, and his great alliances, must certainly, as Conon had foreseen, have strengthened the ascendency of Calixtus II. He was the son of William, reigning Count of Burgundy, surnamed the Great, or Tête-Hardie, one of the most remarkable princes of the eleventh century, who had raised the splendour of his house to its greatest height by adding the counties of Vienne and Mâcon to his domains.[1] Guy had four brothers, three of whom died on the battle-field, fighting for Christ in the East;[2] the fourth, Raymond, by marrying Urraca, daughter and heiress of the King of Castile,[3] had founded in Spain a dynasty of crusaders from

[1] Mâcon by succeeding to his cousin, and Vienne by his marriage with Countess Stephanie. He reigned over the county of Burgundy, since called Franche-Comté, which he had gradually withdrawn from the imperial suzerainty, from 1057 to 1087. St. Gregory VII. wrote several letters to him.

[2] Raynaud II., Count of Burgundy in 1087, killed in 1100; Stephen, one of the heroes of the First Crusade, whose exploits were related so brilliantly by Albert of Aix and Foucher of Chartres, killed at Ramla in 1102; lastly, Hugh, Archbishop of Besançon, also killed in the Crusade.

[3] He had gone to Spain at the head of a force of the Burgundian nobles to fight against the Saracens, in 1093: he died there in 1108, covered with glory.

which was to spring St. Ferdinand and Isabella the Catholic. One of the prince's sisters had married Duke Eudes of Burgundy; another, the Count of Flanders; a third, the Count of Savoy; and the fourth, the Count of Bar and Montbéliard. The Queen of France was niece to the new pope,[1] who was also connected with the Emperor of Germany [2] and the King of England.

Calixtus II. was allied then, by blood, to the most powerful princes of Europe. His nephews ruled Franche-Comté,[3] Burgundy,[4] Flanders,[5] and Castile,[6] and one of them was Archbishop of Besançon.[7]

During the thirty-six years which he had spent in the archiepiscopal see of the old capital of Burgundy,[8] Guy had not only detached his own family from the imperial cause, but had also organised Catholic resistance in Dauphiné and on the banks of the Rhone.

On his accession, Calixtus hastened to send the Cardinal-deacon Roscemann, a monk of Monte Cassino, to Rome to announce his election, which was confirmed there with enthusiasm by the cardinals of the three orders, by all the clergy, by the Roman people,[9] and even by many partisans

[1] Louis le Gros married, in 1115, Adelaide, daughter of Humbert, Count of Maurienne and Savoy, and of Gisèle of Burgundy, sister of Calixtus.

[2] By Agnes of Poitou, wife of the Emperor Henry III.; *consanguinitatis lincam a regibus Alcmanniæ Franciæ atque Angliæ ducens.*—PANDULPH. PISAN., MURATORI, iii. 419. See also SUGER, ap. DUCHESNE, iv. 310.

[3] William III., called the German, son of Raynaud II., reigned from 1100 to 1124.

[4] Hugh II. Beret, Duke of Burgundy, from 1102 to 1142, son of Eudes and Matilda, sister of Calixtus.

[5] Baudouin VII., son of Robert of Friesland and of Clemence of Burgundy, sister of Calixtus († 1119).

[6] Alfonso VII., King of Castile, son of Raymond of Burgundy, and of Donna Urraca.

[7] Hugh IV., son of Guy, Count of Mâcon, and grandson of Guillaume Tête-Hardie.

[8] King Rodolph III. of Burgundy had united the county of Vienne to this see.—FLEURY, b. 67, c. 15.

[9] See their letters in *Cod. Ep. Udalr.*, Nos. 294 to 299.

of the anti-pope, who recognised the hand of God in an election in which simony and ambition had no part.[1] After having been crowned by the Bishop of Ostia,[2] in the old metropolitan church of Vienne,[3] the pope charged Conon to carry the news to his nephew, the King of France, and himself wrote to the two leaders of the Catholic party in Germany, Adalbert of Mayence, and Frederic of Cologne.[4] The event was everywhere greeted with delight.[5] The King of England and Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury readily acknowledged the new head of the Church, though many of the English belonged to the anti-pope's party.[6]

The King of France hastened to send Cardinal Conon, accompanied by two other prelates, to felicitate[7] Calixtus, who received the embassy in Auvergne, whence he went with the indefatigable legate to Toulouse. There the prelates of Aquitaine, Languedoc, part of Spain, and Brittany, assembled in council. Several canons were passed by them intended to preserve the purity and liberty of the Church, and to give up to the secular arm the Manichæan heretics, whose stronghold was always in that region.[8]

The pope then returned northward, passing Quercy, Périgord, Poitou, Anjou, and Touraine, everywhere making his passage remarkable, as his predecessors, Urban II. and Pascal II., had done, by redressing grievances, concluding old quarrels, dedicating new cathedrals and abbey-churches,[9] visiting the chief monasteries, such as Fontevrault, St. Maur,

[1] This is concluded, by Gervais, vol. i. p. 259, from the letter given by MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Collect.*, vol. i. p. 649, where the bishops to whom Calixtus had not written approve his election: "*Quam neque lepra Simonis, neque tumor ambitionis infecit, tanquam a Deo datam amplexati sumus.*"

[2] Lambert, who was afterwards pope under the name of Honorius I.

[3] Feb. 9, 1119.—Letter of Conon, ap. *Hist. Vizeliac.* in *Spicileg.*

[4] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1119; *Hist. littéraire de France*, vol. x. p. 511.

[5] GERVAIS, *loc. cit.*; ANSELM. GEMBLAC., *Chron.*, 1119.

[6] EADM., *Hist. nov.*, v. p. 93.

[7] *Chron. Maurin.*, p. 369.

[8] *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1283; FLEURY, b. 97, c. 2.

[9] Cahors, Fontevrault, St. Maur, Angers, Maurigny.

and Marmoutier, and confirming their privileges and exemptions.[1] During his stay in Anjou, the holy Father extended the protection of the Roman Church over the new monastic creations of Fontevrault and Savigny,[2] which had already borne such excellent fruit.

Having thus made almost the tour of France, and edified all the faithful by his humility and energy, and by the excellence of his ecclesiastical government,[3] Calixtus II. was received at the new abbey of Maurigny, where he was to dedicate the church, by King Louis of France, and by the nobles, who were to accompany him to Paris. Towards the middle of October, the sovereign pontiff went from Paris to Rheims to attend the council, already convoked by Gelasius, and the preparations for which had been arranged by Conon.[4]

Meantime the emperor, even by his unexpected return to Germany, and the vigour with which he carried on the contest there, had not been able to counterbalance the effect produced by the election of the new pope, who had been very readily acknowledged by all the bishops of the empire.[5] The forces of the Catholic party were so increased that Henry V. was obliged to yield to the unanimous wish of the princes and prelates still faithful to his cause, and consent to the holding of a general diet at Tribur, near Mayence. There, the two parties being present, the emperor was to give an account of his conduct to the assembled princes, promising to agree to their decisions.[6] In the interval he

[1] See his itinerary, with the dates of his visits and his diplomas, in the Appendix.

[2] Bulls of September 8 and 16, 1118.

[3] This is Suger's testimony: "*Gloriose humiliter sed strenue Ecclesiæ jura disponens . . . aptius Ecclesiasticis providebat negotiis.*"

[4] *Chron. Maur.*, pp. 368, 369. He had already returned to the pope at Maurigny, after his journey to Rheims. The chronicler of that abbey justly calls him "*Totius Franciæ ac Teutoniæ, Alemanniæ ac Saxoniæ legatus.*"

[5] "Cui cum omnes nostrates episcopis obedientiam professi. . . ."—*Chron. Urspcrg.*, ann. 1119.

[6] "Totius regni sacerdotum atque procerum nuntiis compulsus . . . ubi de omnibus quæ sibimet imponerentur, juxta senatus consultum se satis-

opened negotiations with the envoys of the sovereign pontiff at Strasburg. One of these, Pons, Abbot of Cluny, had long been the emperor's friend, and even his representative with Pascal II. The other, William de Champeaux, Bishop of Châlons, and founder of the famous monastic school of St. Victor, passed for the most zealous and learned of French bishops.[1] For this reason he had been chosen to speak before the diet, which he did as follows: "Would you, my lord the king, conclude a true treaty of peace? In that case, renounce absolutely the investiture of bishoprics and abbeys. To prove to you that your power will not thus suffer any diminution, I tell you that, being elected a bishop in France, I have received no investiture from the king, either before or after consecration; nevertheless, in all which concerns imposts, military service, tolls, and all affairs of the commonwealth, which Christian kings have anciently given to the Church of God, I perform my duties to the State as faithfully as the bishops of your empire can do, after receiving from you the investiture which has been the cause of so much discord and even of excommunication."[2] On hearing this, Henry lifted his hand towards heaven, and cried, "Well, be it so; I seek nothing more."[3]

facturum spopondit."—*Chron. Ursperg., loc. cit.* This diet, first convoked for St. John's Day, 1119, was only held in September. The chronology of these different events is clearly established by Stentzel, vol. ii. p. 331, and confirmed by Gervais.

[1] "Auxiliatorem magnum, qui sublimes scholas rexerat, et tunc zelum Dei habens, super omnes episcopos totius Galliæ divinarum Scripturarum scientia fulgebat."—*Chron. Mauriniac.*, p. 373.

[2] "Scito me in regno Francorum electum, nec ante consecrationem nec post consecrationem aliquid suscepisse de manu regis: cui tamen de tributo, de militia, de telonio et de omnibus quæ ad rempublicam pertinebant, et antiquitus scilicet a regibus christianis Ecclesiæ Dei donata sunt, ita fideliter deservio, sicut in regno tuo episcopi tibi deserviunt," &c.—*Comment.*, HESSONIS SCOLASTICI *in Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1300, and *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 303. This author, to whom the *Chron. Ursperg.* refers as the most trustworthy, ends his narrative with these words: "*Quod vidi et audivi, fideliter, et quanto brevius potui, pedestri sermone descripsi.*"

[3] "Manibus elevatis. . . . Eia, iniquit, sic fiat: non quæro amplius."—*Ibid.*

The Bishop of Châlons resumed: "If you will give up investiture, restore the property of the Church, and of those who have laboured for her, and insure to them real peace, we will endeavour, with God's help, to end the quarrel." [1]

The emperor, after consulting with his friends, formally promised to fulfil the stipulated conditions if the pope would do him justice, and if the envoys would undertake to restore to him and his all the possessions they had lost during the war. Henry V. offered his hand to the bishop and to the abbot, and swore, on his faith as a Christian, that he would observe the conditions honestly.[2] The Bishop of Lausanne, the Count Palatine, and other clerks and laymen of the emperor's suite, swore with him. William and Pons then returned from Strasburg to Paris, to tell the pope the result of their interview. Calixtus heard them joyfully, and only said, "Would to heaven it were already done, if it can be done justly!" [3] The memory of the bad faith from which Pascal had been so treacherously made to suffer could not be absent from the mind of the pontiff, or from that of any Catholic.[4] The pope immediately commissioned his two

[1] "Si investituras dimittere volueris, et possessionem ecclesiarum, et eorum qui pro Ecclesia laboraverunt, reddere, et veram pacem eis dare, laborabimus," &c.—*Comment.*, HESSONIS SCOLASTICI *in Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1300, and *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 303.

[2] "Propria manu, sub testimonio fidei Christianæ in manu episcopi et abbatis firmavit, se præfata capitula persecuturum."—*Ibid. Mit. dem Handschlag.*; STENTZEL.

[3] "Utinam jam factum esset, si sine fraude fieri posset!"—*Ibid.*

[4] Gervais (i. 261) thinks that the pope premeditated this fraud as well as the emperor. This is an entirely gratuitous supposition, and one to support which he brings not the shadow of a proof. But to conform to the pretended impartiality of modern sophists, he thinks himself obliged to establish a sort of factitious equality between the two adversaries, and not being able to deny Henry's dishonesty, he supposes it also in Calixtus. He forgets the terrible antecedent of Henry's conduct towards Pascal II. We much regret to see this learned writer, in all that relates to the Council of Rheims and the interview at Mouzon, departing from the justice which he displays in general. He chooses to suspect of partiality the narrative of Hesson, an eye-witness, who, however, is referred to by the imperialist chronicle of Auersperg in these words: "*Ejusdem actionem concilii, si quis*

plenipotentiaries, and with them two cardinals—the Bishop of Ostia, and Gregory, deacon of St. Angelo [1]—to go to the emperor and promise him absolution if he kept his word. They were to demand also that the reciprocal stipulations should be put in writing, and that a day should be fixed for the next council, at which they were, on both sides, to be ratified.

The emperor, after these happy preliminaries, could go safely to the assembly of the princes at Tribur,[2] where the election of Calixtus was solemnly recognised, and all the German bishops promised obedience to him.[3] The princes thus established and consolidated a defence for their consciences and for their resistance to Henry V. No one thought of the anti-pope Burdin; the unfortunate man, who had betrayed the Church in order to make himself the instrument of the emperor, saw himself in his turn betrayed and abandoned by the very power to which he had sacrificed all.

In the diet the princes and clergy decreed the cessation of hostilities, and the reciprocal restitution of all that had been taken from the emperor [4] or the princes, and approved beforehand of the meeting of the Council of Rheims, where Henry promised to appear in order to bring about a general pacification in the Church.[5] The emperor then started, with an army of 30,000 men, to go to meet the pope. Between Metz and Verdun, the prince met Calixtus's four envoys,

plenarie cognoscere quærit in literis cujusdam scholastici nomine Hessonis eleganter enucleatum reperiri poterit." This account also agrees in every point with that of Ordericus Vitalis, whose independence, sometimes unfriendly to the Court of Rome, cannot be suspected; and these two are the only contemporaries who have spoken, in any detail, of these events.

[1] Both popes, one as Honorius II., and the other as Innocent II.

[2] At the beginning of September.—*Chron. Ursperg.*, corrected by STENTZEL and GERVAIS.

[3] "Cui cum omnes nostrates episcopi obedientiam professi."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, 1119.

[4] The emperor, while restoring all that he had usurped from the princes, promised to content himself with the ancient revenues of the crown.—*Regum antiquorum fiscalia*, *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1119.

[5] *Ibid.*

and renewing, in writing and by oath, the stipulations already arranged at Strasburg,[1] promised to execute them in the pope's presence at Mouzon on Friday the 25th of the following October. The Duke of Bavaria, the Count Palatine and other princes, swore after the emperor, whose oath was as follows: "I, Henry, by the grace of God august emperor of the Romans, for the love of God and St. Peter, and of the lord pope Calixtus, renounce the right of investiture to all churches; I grant peace to all those who, since the beginning of the dispute, have been in arms for the Church; I will restore to the churches, and all those who have laboured for them, such of their possessions as I have withheld, and I will loyally aid them to recover such as I am not myself withholding."

The pope's deed, guaranteed by the oath of his plenipotentiaries, was as follows: "I, Calixtus II., by the grace of God Catholic Bishop of the Roman Church, grant peace to Henry, the august emperor of the Romans, and to all those who have acted with him against the Church; I will restore, or cause to be restored, the possessions of all those who have lost them through this war."

The two engagements ended with this formula: "Every dispute which may arise shall be judged by a canonical judgment if it is ecclesiastical, and by a secular judgment if it is secular."

The Council opened at Rheims on Monday, October 20, 1119. At the pope's summons there had assembled, for the love of God, and in obedience to the Holy See,[2] the prelates not only of France and Germany, but of Brittany, Burgundy, Italy, England, Spain, and the isles of the sea.[3] The King

[1] "Quod prius apud Argentinam . . . firmaverat, iterum in manu episcopi Ostiensis, &c., propria manu firmavit; quod videlicet," &c.—HESSO SCHOLASTIC., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Apostolico jussu evocati . . . congregati sunt pro amore Salvatoris, ejus parati grantanter obedire mandatis."—ORD. VIT., vol. xii. p. 857.

[3] "*De insulis Oceani et cunctis occidentalibus provinciis*," says Ordericus. Does he mean Ireland? or merely the Mediterranean islands?

of England had allowed his Norman and English bishops to appear, but had enjoined them not to bring back into his kingdom any dangerous novelty.[1] Adalbert, Archbishop of Mayence, seeing the approaching triumph of the cause he had so bravely served, arrived with seven hundred German bishops,[2] and an escort of five hundred knights. The pope, delighted at the coming of the great champion of the German Church, sent the Count of Champagne with a numerous train of knights to meet him.[3] There were present sixteen archbishops,[4] more than two hundred bishops, and an equal number of abbots; in all four hundred and twenty-seven crosiers.[5]

Louis le Gros, King of France, though seriously ill, sat in the assembly, together with his principal barons, during the first two days, and declared himself ready to obey the decrees of the Church as became the most Christian king.[6] The crowd of monks, clerks, and laymen present at the council was so great that many thought it seemed a representation of the last judgment.[7] The session was

[1] "Sed superfluas adinventiones regno meo inferre nolite."—ORD. VIT., *loc. cit.* As the matter of investitures had been settled twelve years previously, the king's reservation only applied to the dispute between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, of which we shall have to speak.

[2] Five of them were his own suffragans. There were also one suffragan of Cologne, two of Trèves, two of Magdeburg, and one of Besançon.

[3] ORD. VIT., *loc. cit.* Archbishop Frederic of Cologne did not come, but sent ambassadors to assure the pope of his submission and affection.—*Ibid.*

[4] Ordericus names those of Rheims, Bourges, Sens, Lyons, Rouen, York, Tours, and Dol, "*et alii octo archiepiscopi*," he says. A title-deed of Tours, quoted ap. *Concil.*, xii. 1309, names those of Mayence, Besançon, Tarantasia, and Tarragona. Among the bishops were William de Champeaux, Bishop of Châlons, Hildebert of Le Mans, and Gerard of Angoulême, the three most notable among French bishops.

[5] "Numerabantur ibi personarum pastoralium virgæ 424."—ROGER HOVED., *Ann. Angl.* The learned Hesson, an eye-witness, says 427.

[6] "Quamvis gravi laborantem infirmitate, molestia corporis vehementer urgente."—Ep. LUDOV. ad CALIXT. *in Regest. ad fin.* "Biduo cum principibus suis concilio eidem interfuit et mandata Ecclesiæ sicut catholicus et christianissimus veneratione debita obedivit."—*Concil.*, xii. 1309; cf ORDER., *loc. cit.*

[7] ORDER., *loc. cit.*

held in the metropolitan church of Notre Dame, before the rood-loft.[1]

After having chanted the mass, the pope took his place upon the throne, with the five cardinals at his feet,[2] and standing near him a cardinal-deacon named Chrysogonus, librarian of the Roman Church, who had the book of canons, so that he might read, in case of difficulty, the decisions of the Ancients.[3]

Calixtus preached in Latin from the passage of the Gospel where it is said that Jesus commanded His disciples to embark and put out before Him on a stormy sea.[4] He described the ship of the Church, and pictured the waves of temptation and trouble, and the blast of wickedness, suddenly calmed by the word of the Saviour, who bade Peter walk upon the waters. Then Cardinal Conon rising, addressed the prelates with the greatest eloquence upon their pastoral duty.[5] The sovereign pontiff then explained to the Council his object in calling together his fathers and his brethren in such numbers and from such distances;[6] it was to root out thoroughly, by their help, the simoniacal heresy, which derived all its strength from lay investiture. After this,

[1] "Ante crucifixum:" that is to say, in front of the *ambo*, which was always surmounted by a large cross, as shown in the English denomination of that part of the church—*rood-loft.*

[2] Conon of Palestrina, Lambert of Ostia, Bozo of Porto, John of Crema, and Hatto of Viviers; they were commissioned to examine the questions *præ omnibus aliis*, and they answered all with wonderful erudition.—ORDER., *loc. cit.*

[3] "Manu canones gestabat, promptus propinare authenticas majorum sententias ut res exigebat."—ORDER. VIT.

[4] Matt. xiv. 22.

[5] He applied to them what is said in Genesis (xxxi. 38) of the care taken by Jacob of Laban's flocks. The four Protestant historians whom we have at hand, Raumer, Stentzel, Lüden, and Gervais, none of them quotes this appeal of the pope and of the chief of the cardinals to Holy Scripture, on this solemn occasion. Philosophic learning pretends that the Bible has only been respected and quoted since the Reformation!

[6] "Domini patres et fratres, causa pro qua vos de terra longinqua et remotis regionibus ad concilium vocavimus. . . ."—HESSO SCHOLAST., *in Cod. Udalr.*, p. 303.

Calixtus ordered the Bishop of Ostia to describe in Latin the course of the negotiations with the emperor, and the Bishop of Châlons to repeat the narrative in French, so that it might be understood both by priests and laymen.[1]

The King of France, the Countess of Poitiers, and other injured persons set forth, in their turns, the different complaints for which they demanded justice from the council; but the pope deferred the decision of these and of all other affairs to the close of the proceedings.[2]

After having asked the advice of the bishops as to whether it was fitting that he should go to the stipulated interview with the emperor, and whether he could trust in the good faith of such a man,[3] Calixtus II. announced his resolution to start for Mouzon. He forbade the bishops to depart during his absence,[4] so that he might find them all at hand on his return, to confirm the peace if God permitted it to be arranged, and to make known the news immediately to the whole world; or, if Henry should as usual act the part of a cunning enemy, that he might be able to appeal to the judgment of the Holy Spirit and to that of the bishops, before drawing the sword of St. Peter to punish him.[5] The pope also enjoined the Fathers to consecrate all

[1] "Ex præcepto domini papæ hoc idem clericis et laicis materna lingua exposuit."—HESSO SCHOLAST., *in Cod. Udalr.*, p. 303.

[2] "Cum autem reversus fuero, clamores vestros et ratiocinationes, ut rectius potuero, diligenter discutiam, opitulante Domino."—ORDER.

[3] "Cum in hoc consilium episcoporum sedisset, ut dominus papa ad diem colloquii, pro componenda pace accederet, et utrum in veritate homo ille ageret, per semetipsum tentaret."—HESSO SCHOL.

[4] He declared that he did not even except the Abbot of St. Thierry, whose abbey was at the very gate of Rheims. — ORDER. VIT. This author adds that the prelates were very impatient of a delay which lengthened their absence and increased their expenses: "*Ibi nihil agentes, infructuose sua destrahebant suarumque curam domorum cum mœrore intermittebant.*"

[5] "Si Deus nobis pacem dederit, commune gaudium universo mundo annuncietis. . . . Si autem, quod Deus avertat, adversarius nobiscum in dolo agere temptaverit . . . in commentorem fraudis . . . judicio Spiritus sancti et vestro gladium B. Petri vibrare tentabimus."—*Ibid.*

the time of his absence, and especially the day of the conference, to prayer and sacrifice, and to go barefoot, in procession, to the metropolitan church of St. Rémy. Having given these directions, Calixtus started on October 23rd for Mouzon,[1] where he arrived on Thursday 24th, extremely fatigued. There he called to his apartment the bishops, abbots, and doctors, a great number[2] of whom had accompanied him, and caused to be read to them two documents drawn up in the emperor's name and his own. These papers were minutely examined, and the bishops were of opinion that it was important to see to the clearness of the clause in which Henry declared that he renounced all right of investiture,[3] so that he might not again claim ancient possessions of the Church, and proceed to invest bishops with them. In the second place, the bishops thought it necessary to examine closely that clause of the treaty by which the pope promised a true peace to all who had taken part in the war, lest it might be inferred that he recognised the intruded bishops, or those canonically deposed.[4]

Meantime the companions of the head of the Church had heard, not without alarm, that the emperor was come to the place chosen for the conference, between Mouzon and Yvoy,[5]

[1] Mouzon, an abbey and castle on the Meuse, between Sedan and Stenay, was a seigneury of the archbishopric of Rheims, and was supposed to have been given to that see by Clovis.—De la Haut., *Annales d'Yvois et de Mouzon*, p. 243: Paris, 1822.

[2] Among others, Cardinal John of Crema, the Archbishops of Rheims and Rouen, the Bishops of Châlons and Viviers, the Abbot of Cluny.—Hesso and Order.

[3] "Maxime illud capitulum, ubi dicebatur: dimitte omnem investituram omnium ecclesiarum, dicentes: si quidem rex simpliciter agit, verba ista sufficiunt: si autem . . . aliquid cavillare conatur, determinatione nobis videntur indigere."—Hesso.

[4] "Ne forte in danda pace plus intelligerent quam reddendam communionem Ecclesiæ."—*Ibid.*

[5] Brévilly-sur-les-Chières, a league and a half distant from Yvoy. The latter town is now called Carignan.—De la Haut., *Ann. d'Yvois et de Mouzon, loc. cit.*

at the head of an army of 30,000 men. Fearing lest the crime committed against Pascal II. might be repeated, they decided that the pope should not quit the castle of Mouzon.[1]

Instead of Calixtus, the two former plenipotentiaries, William of Champeaux and Pons of Cluny, together with Cardinal John of Crema, went to meet the emperor in his camp. They showed him the decrees, and explained the clauses to him as had been arranged.[2] The emperor at once denied that he had promised anything of all this.[3]

But the Bishop of Châlons, inflamed by praiseworthy zeal,[4] unsheathed the sword of the divine Word, and answered: "My lord the king, if you dispute the document I have in my hand, and the comment upon it which you have just heard, I am ready to swear on the holy relics and the Gospel that you guaranteed all these conditions in my presence, and that I accepted them in this sense."[5] Henry, overcome by this testimony, and by that of all who were present, and unable longer to deny[6] his previous assent, bitterly reproached those who had made him promise what he could not fulfil without injury to his royal authority. William repeated the explanations already given at Strasburg; he declared that the pope had no wish to diminish the power of the empire or the splendour of the crown, but that, on the contrary, he would desire all to serve their

[1] "Hoc ut animadvertimus . . . papam in præfato castro . . . inclusimus, et . . . exire omnino prohibuimus. . . . Memores quam fraudulenter idem ipse Romam intraverit, et ante aram in basilica S. Petri apostoli Paschalem papam ceperit."—*Discourse of Cardinal John*, ap. ORDERICUS.

[2] "Ostenderunt scripta, determinaverunt capitula prout omnium consilio definitum erat."—HESSO, FLEURY, b. lxvii., No. 6.

[3] "Prima fronte se nihil promissum horum omnino abnegabat."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Zelo Dei inflammatus et gladio Dei verbo accinctus."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Si, domine rex, negare vis . . . paratus sum sub testimonio religiosorum virorum qui inter te et me fuerunt jurare. . . ."—*Ibid.*

[6] "Cumque omnium testimonio vinceretur, tandem compulsus est confiteri quod prius negaverat."

sovereign faithfully, both in peace and war;[1] and that, moreover, the imperial power could not but be increased by abandoning pretensions contrary to the law of God. Henry grew calmer, and demanded a delay until the morrow that he might confer with the princes during the night; above all, he expressed a desire to see Calixtus. The envoys of the pope tried to obtain a private audience of Henry; but always found him surrounded by a crowd of courtiers who flourished their swords and lances to intimidate them,[2] and but too well reminded them of the scenes of violence which had taken place in Rome eight years before. Warned by this, they took the greatest care to keep the pope at a distance from the place of meeting, lest he should meet with the fate of Pascal II.

The imperial officers did not fail to raise difficulties as to the absolution which their master was to receive, saying that it would be intolerable to see an emperor present himself barefoot, as other penitents did, for absolution.[3] The prelates promised to intercede with the holy Father that he would receive Henry V. in private, and shod.

After a whole day passed in interminable discussion (Friday, October 24), the prelates returned to Calixtus, who, despairing of peace, desired to return immediately to Rheims; but at the entreaty of the Count of Troyes and other nobles, he waited until the next day (Saturday 25th) at noon.

Very early in the morning the prelates went to seek the emperor's answer. The Bishop of Châlons told him that he and his colleagues would have been entitled to retire the

[1] "Imo palam omnibus denuntians, ut in exhibitione militiæ et cæteris omnibus, in quibus tibi et antecessoribus tuis servire consueverant, modis omnibus deserviant."

[2] "Lanceas gladiosque suos vibrantes . . . patrem patrum solerter et oculis ejus occultavimus, memores quam fraudulenter," &c.—*Discours du cardinal de Créma au concile*, ap. ORDER.

[3] "Durum sibi, immo importabile videri, si more aliorum, nudis pedibus, dominus suus ad absolutionem accederet."—HESSO, *loc. cit.*

evening before, since Henry had sworn to execute on that day the stipulations agreed upon, but that they had been unwilling for the sake of a single night's delay to render impossible the good which might yet be done. He added that if the emperor would keep his promise, the sovereign pontiff was quite ready to fulfil his.[1] At these words Henry cried out angrily that he consented to the free election of bishops and abbots, but that before renouncing investiture of ecclesiastical property,[2] it was necessary that he should convoke a general diet of the princes and obtain their consent. He did not choose to remember that the diet of Tribur had quite lately authorised him to treat upon the basis of the preliminaries arranged at Strasburg, preliminaries which depended upon the surrender of investitures. Convinced of Henry's bad faith, the Bishop of Châlons then said to him, "Since these demands for delay prove that you do not intend to keep your promises, henceforward there can be nothing in common between you and us."[3] The prelate then retired without other leave-taking, and rejoined the holy Father, who immediately started from Mouzon to hasten to another castle in the neighbourhood belonging to the Count of Champagne.[4] Henry, on hearing of the pope's departure, sent to beg the count to detain him at this place over the Sunday, protesting that on the Monday he would, without fail, fulfil the promise he had so many times given and withdrawn.[5] But the pope answered with indignation, "For love of peace I have done that which, as far as I

[1] "Heri quidem, domine rex, cum justitia possemus a te recedere," &c. —HESSO, *loc. cit.*

[2] Hesso does not mention this distinction, which, however, we think probable, and which is distinctly stated by Roger Hoveden.—*Ann. Anglic.* ap. *Concil.*, xii. 1308.

[3] "Quia sæpe inducias quærendo, quæ promisisti implere dissimulas, nihil nobis et tibi amplius : revertar ad dominum papam."—HESSO.

[4] Perhaps Vouziers. The Count of Troyes or Champagne was Hugh I., who afterwards became a Templar.

[5] "Promittens se facturum omnimodis feria II quod toties abnegaverat." —HESSO.

know, none of my predecessors ever did; I have left a general council assembled, while I came with great fatigue to meet this man, who shows no inclination for peace. I will wait no longer; I shall return as quickly as possible to my brethren: but whether during the council or afterwards, if God grant us a true peace, I shall always be ready to receive the emperor with open arms."[1]

As the prelates feared lest Henry should pursue Calixtus with his army,[2] the holy Father set out before day, on Sunday, October 16th, and travelled so quickly that he reached Rheims, after a journey of twenty leagues, soon enough to celebrate mass and to consecrate as Bishop of Liège, on the same day, the candidate rejected by the emperor.[3]

After two days' rest, during which Cardinal John of Crema related to the council the ill-success of their journey, Calixtus reopened the sittings, and on Wednesday, October 29th, ordered the reading of the five canons or decrees which the council was to pronounce, and which summed up and confirmed the conquests won for the Church's freedom and discipline since the days of Gregory VII.

The first canon forbade simony in all shapes; the second, investitures; the third maintained the inviolability of gifts and oblations made to the Church; the fourth forbade the bequeathing of benefices as if by hereditary right,

[1] "Feci, fratres, pro desiderio pacis . . . ad hominem istum cum multo labore perveniens, ea quæ pacis sunt in eo non inveni. . . . Si autem in concilio vel post concilium, veram pacem Deus nobis dederit, paratus ero suscipere et amplecti."—HESSO.

[2] "Iter repedandi, immo fugiendi, velociter inivimus, quin etiam ne formidabiliter tyrannus cum multis legionibus quas secum ducebat persequeretur, nos valde timuimus."—*Speech of the Cardinal of Crema*, ap. ORDERICUS, *loc. cit.*

[3] "*Tanta festinatione Remis usque cucurrit, ut vigiliti lucis consummatis eadem die Remis missam celebraret.*"—HESSO. It is indeed twenty leagues from Mouzon to Rheims; but the pope did not travel the whole distance in one morning, since he had passed the Saturday night in a castle of the Count of Champagne nearer to Rheims than Mouzon.

and the receiving of fees for baptism, and other sacraments, and for burial; the last imposed celibacy on all clerks.[1]

Each canon pronounced an anathema upon any one who should violate it. At the reading of the decree relative to investiture, the terms of which forbade it to all laymen with regard to churches and ecclesiastical property, a great murmur arose [2] among some ecclesiastics and a great many of the laity, for they thought the pope meant to deprive them of the tithes and ecclesiastical benefices or church property which they had long enjoyed. A discussion followed that lasted till evening. Calixtus put off the decision until the following day, October 30th, the last day of the council. On that day the holy Father opened the sitting with the singing of the hymn to the Holy Spirit, which was taken up with great fervour by the whole assembly.[3] Then, suddenly inspired by a supernatural eloquence not usual with him,[4] he described, in burning words, amidst the general admiration,[5] the action of this Holy Spirit, the source of all wisdom and of all

[1] This law was still resisted in certain countries, and especially in Normandy, where Archbishop Geoffrey of Rouen, having wished to proclaim this canon in a synod held in that city in 1119, met with so much resistance from the parish priests, that a fierce disturbance took place in the very metropolis itself.—ORDER. VIT., b. xii.

[2] "Tantum murmur . . . insonuit."—HESSO. According to Roger Hoveden, this opposition, and the pope's speech which ended it, were caused by the excommunication of Henry. . . . "*Henricus excommunicandus. Quod cum quidam in concilio ægre ferrent, sententiam protulit Apostolicus ut qui in hoc scandalizarentur, exeuntes*," &c. We think it better to follow the version of Hesso, an eyewitness. Henry had been excommunicated several times, and the new promulgation of the sentence was less likely to cause difficulties than a general law which affected the personal interests of the laymen attending the council. Noel Alexander, not to be suspected of partiality for the pontifical cause, contests on other grounds the correctness of Roger Hoveden's account.

[3] "Qui cum ab omnibus fuisset affectuose decantatus."

[4] See above, at the Council of Vienne.

[5] "Vere invisibilis ignis flamma succensus, in ignea lingua exorsus, mirabiliter peroravit . . . diutius sub omnium admiratione."—HESSO.

discipline, the bond of union, peace, and charity. "We know, dearest brothers," said the pontiff, in conclusion, "that the zeal which has brought you from such distances to labour with us for the universal freedom of our holy mother the Church,[1] has been pleasing to God and to the Holy Spirit who unites us; but this zeal has displeased the spirit of evil, who has been able to find instruments of his malice to trouble our brotherly concord. Now, what will be said if, after having come to the council with such trouble and cost, you should return to your different dioceses, taking nothing with you because you will not listen to us?[2] . . . Yesterday, when we offered our propositions for the liberty of the Church, some persons were scandalised. To-day, we say with the apostles, 'If there is an unbeliever here let him depart and leave the faithful to deal with what belongs to the Church and is necessary to her freedom.' And to you, who hold the place of apostles in the Church of God, we say, as the Lord said to the twelve, 'Will you also go away?'"[3]

The assembly was deeply moved, and not a word of protest was spoken.[4] The canon, however, which had just been read by the pope's command, and which referred to investitures, had undergone an important change in no longer applying to anything but bishoprics and abbeys.[5] In this new form it was unanimously approved and adopted as well as the four others. After having thus fixed the Catholic law, the next thing was to give it effect. Odel-

[1] "Pro communi libertate matris nostræ Ecclesiæ."—HESSO.

[2] "Revertentes ad regiones vestras nihil reportare poteritis. . . ."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Quod si infidelis discedit, discedat."—1 Cor. vii. 15. "Et vos vultis abire?"—JOHN vi. 68.

[4] "Ita omnium corda concussit ac reclamantium voces compressit, ut nec unus quidem contra decreta synodica quæ postea lecta sunt, os aperire præsumeret."—HESSO.

[5] "Investituram *Episcopatuum et Abbatiarum* per manum laicam fieri omni modo prohibemus." The original text had, "*Investituram omnium Ecclesiarum per manum*," &c.

garius, a Catalan [1] monk and Bishop of Barcelona, emaciated, feeble, but equally learned and eloquent, who had been unwillingly obliged to become a bishop by Pascal II., preached an admirable sermon on the royal and the priestly power.[2] After which four hundred and twenty-seven tapers were brought, lighted, and distributed to the four hundred and twenty-seven bishops and mitred abbots.[3] All then rose, taper in hand; the pope in a troubled voice pronounced the solemn sentence of excommunication, until complete satisfaction should be made,[4] against Henry V. and the anti-Pope Burdin, with their chief partisans and other hardened criminals. At the same moment all the tapers were thrown to the ground and extinguished.[5] The pope also declared that, in virtue of his apostolic authority, he released from their oath of fidelity all those who had sworn it to Henry, until he should have done penance [6] and given satisfaction to the Church of God. Calixtus then gave absolution and his benediction to all, and the council was closed.

Never, since the Church had been founded, had so terrible a sentence been pronounced by so numerous an assembly and in so imposing a form.

The pope's struggle against the emperor's usurpations and the custom of investiture was not the only object of

[1] Before being a bishop he had been abbot of the regular canons of St. Ruf.

[2] "Corpore quidem macilentus et mediocris, sed eruditione cum facundia et religione præcipuus, subtilem satisque profundum sermonem . . . quem summa cuncti qui percipere poterant, hauserunt aviditate." — ORDER. VITAL.

[3] "Allatæ sunt denique candelæ ccccxxvii, et accensæ datæ singulæ singulis tenentibus baculos episcopis et abbatibus." — HESSO, eye-witness.

[4] "Tunc papa. . . . Henricum imperatorem Theomachum . . . &c. mœrens excommunicavit."—ORD. VIT.

[5] Such was the constant custom at solemn excommunications.

[6] "Absolvit a fidelitate regis omnes quotquot ei juraverant, nisi forte resipisceret et Ecclesiæ Dei satisfaceret."—HESSO.

the council's deliberations. Before starting for Mouzon, the pope had lamented at length over the miseries and devastations which resulted from private wars; and with the purpose of protecting the members of Christ, the Christian people ransomed by the blood of the Son of God made man, and to establish peace on earth,[1] he again decreed the Truce of God, which Urban II. had established at the Council of Clermont, adding measures adapted to render its observation more complete. It was ordered, for example, under pain of deposition and the penalties of perjury, that all chaplains of fortresses, and monks inhabiting *cells* or priories founded by nobles in the neighbourhood of their castles, should cease divine service as soon as they should see booty or prisoners brought in, and not resume it until these objects should be restored, or justice done in some way.[2] Every Wednesday at sunset the bells were to ring for peace until the sunrise of the Monday following; hostilities were also forbidden during Advent, Lent, Easter, vigils, and fasts, and all the festivals of the Blessed Virgin.[3] Monks, women with their escort, hunters, and travellers were always to enjoy peace.[4]

Monastic institutions were nobly represented in this great assize of Christendom by the crosiers of more than 200 abbots. Vital, head of the new congregation of Savigny, preached there with such force as to make Pope Calixtus publicly declare that no one on this side the Alps had ever

[1] "Filius Dei pro pace de cœlo descendit . . . ut letalem guerram per protoplasti reatum progressam pie sedaret. . . . Membra quippe Christi populum Christianum appello, quem ipse sanguinis sui pretio redemit."—ORDER., *loc. cit.*

[2] "Capellani castrorum jurant, si præda vel quodcumque raptum, vel captus aliquis ipsis scientibus ad castrum . . . deductum fuerit, se nullum divinum officium ibi celebrare, non expectantes alicujus reclamationem, donec reddatur ablatum," &c.—*Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1292.

[3] The time usually reserved by the Truce of God was from the sound of bells of the parish church on Wednesday evening to sunrise on the Monday.—*Ibid.*

[4] "Omni tempore pacem habeant."

made him so well understand his obligations and his defects.[1] Norbert, who had defended Pascal II. when a captive, and done homage to Gelasius II. when an exile, came to greet Calixtus II., a conqueror at Rheims; he arrived barefoot, according to his custom, and excited the admiration of the assembled prelates by the strictness of his penances and the eloquence of his sermons. The pope confirmed to him the right of preaching everywhere, and specially recommended him to Bishop Barthélemy of Laon, in whose diocese Norbert next year founded the headquarters of the Premontratensian Order.[2] The order of Cluny, in the person of its Abbot Pons, had interposed too vigorously in the most serious affairs of the Church for its rights not to be scrupulously maintained by the pope and council. Therefore, when the Archbishop of Lyons and his suffragans, in the name of the Bishop of Mâcon, rose to complain of the immunities and usurpations of Cluny, a lively emotion stirred the assembly.[3] Abbot Pons also rose, and a crowd of monks with him. After having calmly repelled the accusations brought against his house,[4] he concluded by saying: "The church of Cluny is subject only to the Roman Church—it is the special property of the pope. Because we vigorously defend what the faithful have given to us for the love of God, we are called usurpers, and suffer all kinds of reproach. I shall not trouble myself much

[1] ETIENNE DE FOUGÈRES, *Vie manuscrite*, b. ii. c. 12; FLEURY, *Hist. eccles.*, b. lxvii. c. 10. He died three years afterwards, giving the strongest proof of his love for the Rule. Being hopelessly ill, and having received the last sacraments, he would nevertheless attend in the choir, and died while singing matins, Sept. 24, 1122.—ORD. VIT.

[2] *Vit. S. Norbert*, c. 4, ap. BOLLAND., *Act. SS.*, Junii, vol. i.

[3] Many other bishops, clerks, and monks of various orders joined in these complaints, and a great disturbance in the council resulted. "*Cum vociferatione clamores fecerunt . . . diuque perstrepentes, acerba quæ ruminaverant evomuerunt*," says Ordericus, who was a monk of an abbey subject to Cluny, and a great partisan of Abbot Pons.

[4] "Modesta voce et tranquilla elocutione querulosos impetitores compressit."—*Ibid.*

about it. It is the affair of our lord the pope; let him defend his church if it pleases him."[1]

After a day of inquiry, Cardinal John of Crema pronounced, in the name of Calixtus, a sentence which referred to the foundation of Cluny by Gerard de Roussillon, on the express condition that she should be subject only to Rome, and which, by the authority of God, commanded all sons of the Church to support the great abbey in peace, in her ancient freedom, and in all her exemptions and possessions.[2]

Many other complaints and disputes were brought before the council and judged according to the report of four French bishops, Gerard of Angoulême, Hatto of Viviers, Geoffroy of Chartres, and William of Châlons, who were considered as princes among the speakers.[3] The venerable assembly was specially attentive and interested when Hildegarde, Duchess of Aquitaine and Countess of Poitiers, advancing into the midst of the church, followed by her servants, pleaded eloquently[4] her own cause against her faithless husband Duke William, who had deserted her for Malberge, Viscountess of Châtellerault. This was the same Duke William of Aquitaine who, repenting of his violent behaviour to the prelates at the Council of Poitiers in 1100, had gone to the Crusade to expiate his fault. That holy pilgrimage had not, however, amended the warrior's morals. He was so passionately in love with the viscountess that he always carried her portrait attached to his shield, that it might be with him in all his battles; and when the legate

[1] "Cluniacensis Ecclesia soli Romanæ Ecclesiæ subdita est et papæ propria. . . . Nimia de his ad me sollicitudo non pertinet. Ecclesiam suam dominus papa defendat si vult."—BOLLAND., *loc. cit.*

[2] "*Romana auctoritas Cluniacensium privilegia corroborat, et in virtute Dei omnibus ecclesiæ filiis imperat, ne quis*," &c.—*Ibid.* Ordericus adds that several prelates were much dissatisfied with this decree, "*quamvis aperte contradicere jussionibus papæ non auderent.*"

[3] "Duces verbi præ ceteris intonuerunt."—ORDER. VIT.

[4] "Processit et alta claraque voce querimoniam eloquenter enodavit, quam omne concilium diligenter auscultavit."—*Ibid.*

Gerard of Angoulême had excommunicated him on account of his open immorality, he had ridiculed the prelate, who was bald, saying, "You will comb the hair over your forehead before I leave my love."[1]

After having heard the duchess's complaint, the pope asked whether William, in obedience to his summons, had come to the council? Several bishops from Aquitaine rose and answered that their duke had been left sick on the road. A postponement was therefore granted to him, that he might present himself at the pontiff's court, and there reclaim his wife under pain of anathema.[2]

A person of yet higher rank than the Duchess of Aquitaine had appeared before the council on the day of its opening. King Louis of France, attended by his barons, mounting the platform on which the pontifical throne was raised, had there brought his complaint against Henry of England.[3] He chiefly accused him of having unjustly deprived of the Duchy of Normandy, which owed feudal homage to France, his elder brother Robert, whom he kept in prison, and whose son William now accompanied the

[1] FLEURY, *Hist. eccles.*, b. lxvii. c. 5, adds the following story: Pierre, Bishop of Poitiers, went to remonstrate with him on the same crime, and as he would not repent, Pierre began to pronounce his excommunication. The duke, furious, seized him by the hair, and brandishing his sword, said, "I will kill you this moment if you do not give me absolution." The bishop pretended to be frightened, and as soon as the duke released him boldly finished the excommunication, then holding out his neck, he said, "Strike, then! strike!" The duke, who was famed for his wit, answered, "I hate you too much to send you to Paradise." Shortly afterwards, however, he condemned the bishop to exile, where he died like a saint. Miracles were worked at his tomb; and the duke, when he was informed of this, said, "I am sorry I did not hasten his death; he would have been under an obligation to me."

[2] The end of this affair is not known. William IX., Duke of Aquitaine, who was the first of the Troubadours, died February 10, 1127.—*Hist. litt. de France*, vol. ix. p. 42.

[3] "In consistorium ubi papa residens omnibus præeminebat, conscendit, querimoniamque suam rationabiliter deprompsit. . . . Ad hanc, inquit, concionem pro investigando consilio, cum baronibus meis venio, domine papa: et vos, o seniores, audite me, obsecro."—ORDER. VIT.

king. Louis also imputed to the English monarch the captivity of Robert of Bellesme, and especially that of Count William of Nevers, a good and loyal baron,[1] whom Count Thibault of Blois, nephew of Henry, but vassal of the French crown, had stopped and imprisoned on the return of the expedition ordered by the Council of Beauvais in 1114 against Thomas de Marle.[2]

All the Frenchmen present at the council confirmed the truth of the accusations brought by their king;[3] but the Archbishop of Rouen, supported by the bishops and abbots, amidst a great tumult, undertook to refute them. The pope ended the dispute by promising to go, after the council, to meet the English king, who was his godson and relative,[4] and to engage him, as well as the Count of Blois, to support the cause of justice and peace, lest he should have to suffer a terrible anathema. Calixtus had indeed the greatest interest in restoring good intelligence between the two kings, united by so many bonds, and whose alliance was so useful to the cause of the Church. He had also various ecclesiastical disputes to settle with Henry of England, who had fallen back into many of his old evil ways, and who would neither consent to receive legates from the Holy See into his kingdom, nor permit the pope

[1] "Bonum legitimumque virum."—ORDER. VIT.

[2] "*Mihi generalem inimicum peregrinorum et omnium simplicium obsidere præceperunt, et ipsi mecum, legitimique barones Galliæ. . . .*" — *Ibid.* We may notice here the original sense given by Orderic to the adjective *legitimus*, i.e., *legem timens*. An entirely different account of the cause of William of Nevers's captivity is given by Réne de Blois *in contin. Hist. Croyland*, and by Jean de Marmoutiers in his *Hist. de Geoffroy d'Anjou*, afterwards son-in-law of Henry I., and founder of the house of Plantagenet, *in not. ad Yvonis*, Ep., p. 208. He was made prisoner by Geoffrey, of whom it is said, "*Pictos leones præferens in clypeo, veris leonibus nulla erat inferior feritudo;*" these *pictos leones* are the lions which the Plantagenets made the arms of England.

[3] "Cum . . . Gallicana concio veracem ejus orationem allegasset."—ORDER. VIT.

[4] "Spiritualem filium meum et originis propinquitate consobrinum regem Anglorum adibo," &c.

to consecrate Archbishop Thurstan of York, to the prejudice of the primatial see of Canterbury.[1] However, Calixtus having performed that ceremony at Rheims, just before the opening of the council,[2] went from Rheims to Gisors, where he had the desired interview with the King of England. Henry received him with the greatest respect, and knelt before him. The pope raised him, gave him his blessing and the kiss of peace,[3] and then requested him, in the name of the council, to restore to his brother both his liberty and the Duchy of Normandy. But the king drew such a picture of the state of disorder and misery into which the churches and people of Normandy had fallen during Robert's administration, on account of his total incapacity, that the pope yielded to the monarch's arguments and deferred the question. At the same time he became yet more zealous in bringing about a reconciliation between the two princes: peace was concluded under the mediation of the sovereign pontiff, on condition of the reciprocal restitution of the prisoners and of the castles taken, amidst the general joy of both nations.[4] Calixtus was less fortunate in what concerned the special interests of the Church; he was obliged to concede to the English king the confirmation of those customs which the Conqueror had established, and to renounce the right of sending any

[1] See in Eadmer, *Hist. nov.*, b. v. pp. 88-95, the details of these disputes, and the difficulties met with by Anselm the legate, nephew of the great and holy archbishop of the same name, a monk like his uncle, and Abbot of St. Saba at Rome, afterwards Abbot of St. Edmundsbury and Bishop of London.

[2] Humbauld, Archbishop of Lyons, refused to be present at this ceremony, in spite of the pope's commands, having a horror, says Eadmer (a monk of Canterbury), of the injury done to that church, with which that of Lyons, since she had served as an asylum to Anselm, had been allied by a special brotherhood.

[3] "Ad pedes pronus accessit . . . sibique consanguinitate propinquum agnovit. Quem papa humiliatum benigniter erexit . . . benedixit, datoque osculo pacis inter mutuos amplexus uterque exultavit."—ORDER. VIT., b. xii. p. 864.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 866.

other legate to England than those whose nomination should be assented to by the sovereign.[1] Though kings may often have succeeded in conciliating the favour of pontifical legates, yet they were, not the less, very formidable. Henry ventured to oppose a long resistance to the admission of Thurstan to the archbishopric of York; but he was obliged to submit when Calixtus, having by a solemn bull established the independence of that metropolitan see, threatened to excommunicate the king, and to depose the primate, if, in a month's time, Thurstan was not admitted to his diocese.[2]

Having thus punished the emperor at Rheims, restored peace between the kings of France and England, and consolidated his authority in both their kingdoms, the victorious pope set out towards Rome, which he had not visited since his election, and where a phantom anti-pope still reigned. On both sides of the Alps the march of the pontiff was a triumphal procession; everywhere an innumerable crowd of the faithful flocked about his steps to show their love and reverence for the Vicar of Christ.[3] The King

[1] Such is Eadmer's account (*Hist. nov.*, b. v. p. 95). He was above all things a monk of Canterbury, and much irritated against Calixtus on account of the decrees given by the pontiff in favour of the independence of York. But this account agrees ill with the fact of the legation in England of the famous Cardinal Peter, son of Leo, two years after the interview at Gisors. Even in Eadmer, however, we may remark the artifices used by Henry I. to prevent this legate from communicating with monasteries and churches during his residence in England. Pope Calixtus had himself been legate in England at the beginning of Henry's reign. It must be added that St. Anselm also had declared against any other legation than his own as archbishop and *ex officio* legate (Ep. iv. 2, ad Paschal). The claim of the English to receive no other legate than their own archbishop is identical with that which was afterwards made in Sicily under the name of *Monarchia Siciliæ*. The kings of Sicily claimed, in virtue of a decree of Urban II., which Baronius has proved false, to be themselves *ex officio* legates in their kingdom.

[2] ROGER HOVEDEN, ap. in BARONIUS, in ann. 1119, c. xiii. The bull was published at Gap, March 3, 1120. See TH. STUBBS, *Act. Pontific. Eborac.* in SELDEN, *Script. Angl.*, ii. p. 1716.

[3] "Undique confluente immunera multitudine populorum, eum tanquam

of France accompanied him as far as Melun.[1] In passing Saulieu, Calixtus solemnly confirmed, under the name of the *Charter of Charity*, the constitution of the new order of Cistercians, which, with that of the Premonstratensians, whose foundations had been laid at Rheims, was to occupy the foremost rank among monastic institutions. The pope celebrated, by processions of horsemen,[2] the festival of Christmas at Autun, and those of the Circumcision and of Epiphany (1120) at Cluny, among the numerous Burgundian nobility, and with all the united splendours of the Roman Court and the queen of abbeys.[3] After having publicly heard the still surviving witnesses to the holiness of the great Abbot Hugh,[4] the sovereign pontiff canonised him, and ordered that his festival should be annually celebrated. Calixtus also decided that the Abbot of Cluny should everywhere enjoy the rank of cardinal,[5] so that his absolute and perfect exemption might be distinctly known. Two archbishops, one German and the other English, accompanied the pope on his travels; both of them obtained the justice they sought from him.

During his stay at Cluny, Calixtus caused a deed to be drawn up, to re-establish Bishop Bruno of Trèves in the independence which was disputed by Archbishop Adalbert of Mayence, as primate and legate. The sovereign pontiff

Christi Vicarium omnes nimio venerabantur affectu et ad ejus vestigia certatim se devotissime prosternebant."—*Vit. Calixt. in Murator. Script.*, vol. iii. p. 419.

[1] *Chron. Mauriniac.* See itinerary of Calixtus and Appendix.

[2] "In solemnibus processionibus equitando factis, quando more Apostolico coronatus fuit."—*Act. Pontif. Eborac.* ap. PAGI, *Crit.*, ann. 1120, c. 1.

[3] "Copioso pontificum et cardinalium choro constipatus. . . . Hunc quam multi Burgundiæ nobiles sequebantur. . . ."—*Biblioth. Cluniac.*, p. 560.

[4] "Non quorumlibet chartulas, . . . sed personas authenticas in medio Cluniacensi capitulo præsentatas, de sancto quæ viderant et audierant validius attestatas. . . . Episcopis pariter et cardinalibus pariter assentientibus."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Ut sic manifestum appareat cunctis, quia tecum et tua Cluniacus solius papæ Romani proprie propria censetur, quæ sub alterius jure pontificis, seu cujuslibet potestatis, providente Deo, nec fuit aliquando, nec erit in futuro."—*Ibid.*

thus sacrificed to justice the policy of conciliating the chief leader of the Catholic party in Germany.[1]

At Gap, the pope, by a similar bull, released the Archbishop of York for ever from the jurisdiction of the primate of Canterbury.[2] And yet he had just formed into a primacy his see of Vienne, giving it jurisdiction over the seven ecclesiastical provinces which extended from the Alps to the Pyrenees.[3]

In Italy the holy Father was received with no less enthusiasm than in France and Burgundy; the populous towns of Lombardy and Tuscany, Milan, Lucca, and especially Pisa, rivalled each other in proofs of attachment[4] and admiration. At the news of his approach, the anti-Pope Burdin, desperate at seeing himself abandoned by the emperor, fled for refuge to the fortress of Sutri, while Rome opened her gates to the legitimate pope. He was received with a pomp and a popular eagerness never shown in honour of any other pontiff.[5] After being a witness to

[1] Bruno had used rather equivocal manœuvres in his relations with the emperor.—*Gest. Treviror* ap. LEIBNITZ, *Access.*, pp. 110-118. PAGI, *Crit.*, ann. 1120, c. 2.

[2] *Act. Pontif. Eborac., loc. cit.*

[3] Tarentaise, Aix, Embrun, Bourges, Auch, Narbonne, and Bordeaux. The archbishops of Bourges and Narbonne, being already called primates, those of Vienne took occasion to call themselves *primate of primates*. But this was an empty title.—FLEURY, *Hist. eccles.*, b. 67, c. 15.

[4] "Quem Francia, Longobardia, Tuscia, Apulia prædicat."—Ep. EGINON., ap. BARON. "Descendens ad populosas Lombardiæ civitates in quibus non minore honorificentia recipiebatur quam devotissima devotione tractabatur."—*Vit. Calixt.* ap. MURAT. and BARON. In this life are found details of his triumphal entry into Lucca and Pisa, where he reconsecrated the metropolitan church, *tota ibidem Tuscia concurrente*. Probably Gelasius II. had only consecrated the choir, and Calixtus the nave, or even some side altars.—ST. MARC, *Hist. d'Italie*, vol. iv. p. 1075.

[5] PANDULPH., *loc. cit.*, FALCO BENEVENT., ann. 1120. This entry was on June 3, 1120. A bull is quoted, dated from the Lateran, June 1st (which shows an error of at least three days), by which the pope grants to Aynard, Lord of Clermont in Dauphiny, and ancestor of the illustrious house of Clermont-Tonnerre, Montoison, d'Amboise, &c., in consideration of having escorted him to Rome with his soldiers in spite of the emperor and the anti-pope, and also in consideration of services rendered to the Church by his father Sibald and his grandfather Aynard, the right to

the glorious procession of the pope to the Lateran amidst the chanting of Latin, Greek, and even Hebrew hymns, by an immense train of little children carrying palms, as at our Saviour's entry into Jerusalem, and by the Roman chivalry, who had hastened to meet Calixtus while he was still three days' journey distant from the city, a German abbot of the pontifical suite wrote to his countrymen that Cæsar would have beheld with indignation his own glory surpassed, and Cicero would perhaps have become a Christian if he could have seen the banner of the cross borne proudly above those of consuls and emperors.[1]

On the eve of this triumphal entry, Calixtus granted to a knight of Dauphiny, founder of the illustrious house of Clermont-Tonnerre, who had escorted him from the banks of the Rhone to Rome, the favour of bearing as his arms the keys and tiara, with the proud motto, "*Etsi omnes, ego non.*"

After having edified all Rome by his gentleness, his disinterestedness,[2] and the austerity of his life,[3] and after

bear: gules, two silver keys placed saltire-wise, with a tiara for crest, and to touch all relics and consecrated things (except the vases used for consecration), on condition of kissing the feet of the pope and his successors, with these words: "*Si omnes te negaverint nunquam te negabo;*" or, according to others, "*Etiamsi omnes, ego non.*" *Vraie et parfaite science des armoiries de Louvan Géliot*, added to by Pierre Palliot (Dijon, 1661—folio), p. 176. The noble allusion made to this device, in 1828, by the last Cardinal de Clermont-Tonnerre is well known. The examples we have already mentioned of Geoffrey of Anjou and of the Duke of Aquitaine show the symbolical importance attached in those days to the use of armorial bearings.

[1] "Cæsar si superesset, indignans miraretur. Tullius forsitan attraheretur, dum vexilla crucis omnium consulum et imperatorum superari trophæa conspicaretur."—Ep. EGINON., ap. BARON., ann. 1120; and CANIS., *Thes. anecdot.*, vol. ii. p. 240. This Egino was abbot of St. Ulrich at Augsburg; he had had to maintain a fierce conflict with the schismatic bishop of Augsburg, and, by Adalbert's advice, had gone to join Calixtus in Italy. The pope took him to Rome, so that on his return to Germany he might be able to describe the Church's triumph: "relaturi terræ nostræ (ut ipsius verbis utamur) triumphum Ecclesiæ." He died the same year, at Pisa, on his way home, after having dictated the above letter.

[2] GUILL. MALM., ap. BARON. He encouraged the English to make pilgrimages to St. James of Compostella rather than to Rome.

[3] Ep. EGINON., *loc. cit.*

having avenged the injuries done to Gelasius and the outraged dignity of the pontificate, by causing the fortified towers of Cencio Frangipani to be rased, the pope followed the example of his predecessors, and went to seek rest and refreshment at Monte Cassino, where he stayed two months.[1]

At Benevento all the Norman princes came to swear fealty and do homage to Calixtus; and at Traja, their chief, Duke William of Apulia, served the sovereign pontiff as squire, leading his horse by the bridle at his entrance into the town.[2]

In the spring of 1122, these warriors gave the pope their help to put an end to the incursions of the schismatics, who, quartered at Sutri, cruelly ravaged the environs of Rome, killing and mutilating those who were going to the legitimate pope, if they refused to come and prostrate themselves before the anti-pope.[3]

The siege of Sutri was undertaken by an army half Norman and half Roman, led by the sovereign pontiff. The inhabitants gave up Burdin to the besiegers, and this great culprit had to endure the maledictions of the soldiery. "Thou hast dared," they cried, "to tear the robe of Christ, to destroy Catholic unity; accursed a thousand times be thou for having brought such scandal into the world."[4] Then they mounted him upon the camel[5] which carried the cooking utensils of the true pope, with his face to the tail, made him hold the tail for a bridle, and put a bleeding goat-skin on his back to imitate the red cope worn by popes. In this guise Burdin made his entry into Rome, that the past shame of the Church might be avenged, and

[1] PETR. DIAC., *Chron. Cass.*, b. iv. c. 70.

[2] "Cui vice stratoris ipse juxta sellam obambulans . . ."—ROMUALD. PALERNIT., *Chron.*, ap. BARON., FALCO BENEVENT., *loc. cit.*

[3] SUGER, *De Vit. Lud. Gross.*, p. 310.

[4] "Maledicte, maledicte, per quem tam magnum scandalum venit!"—CARD. ARAGON., *Vit. Calixt.*; MURAT., vol. iii. p. 420.

[5] "Tortuoso animali tortuosum antipapam, anno antechristum," says SUGER, *loc. cit.* "Super camelum qui ferebat calderias pontificis Calixti."—*Vit. Pontif.* in *Spicileg.*, Rom. ed. card. Maï, vol. vi. p. 299.

those warned who in the future should be tempted to imitate his crime.[1] Calixtus, with difficulty, snatched the unfortunate man from his tormentors, and decided to shut him up in a monastery, where he ended his days.[2] The pope announced the event to the French bishops, inviting them to thank God with him that he had been able to break the idol of the King of the Germans, and to destroy his diabolical nest. Then he applied himself to the restoration, in Rome and its environs, of order, security, and the inviolability of offerings; and avenged the Church's dignity by destroying, as we have said, the fortresses of Cencio Frangipani, who had so shamefully outraged Gelasius II.[3]

While he was thus vanquishing that schism whose consequences had been so pernicious to Italy,[4] the holy Father maintained and extended his authority in other Christian kingdoms by means of the zealous legates, whose experience

[1] "Ignominiam Ecclesiæ Dei ulciscentes." — SUGER, *loc. cit.* "In exemplum aliorum, ne similia quis ultra auderet tentare."—*Vit. Calixt.*, *loc. cit.*

[2] ". . . *Vix a manibus eorum domino Apostolico illum eripiente.*"—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1121. "Impetrante domino Papa."—SUGER, *loc. cit.* Will it be believed that in spite of these two distinct contemporary witnesses to Calixtus's merciful interposition, three Protestant historians—LÜDEN (vol. ix. p. 509), STENTZEL (vol. i. p. 699), and GERVAIS (vol. i. p. 295)—have dared not only completely to suppress them, but also to attribute exclusively to Calixtus, and to his base desire for vengeance, the harsh treatment which Burdin suffered! Let us imagine for a moment that the imperialist pope had triumphed over the Catholic one, and then interfered to save his rival's life, and then ask ourselves how these historians would have represented the facts! But against the Church and her champions falsehood is and always has been permissible. Let us add that these writers have not even the pretence of contemporary authority for their slanders. The only author whose expressions would seem to show that the pope had any share in Burdin's treatment is William of Tyre. But he wrote half a century later, and consequently his testimony has no value, especially as he says that Calixtus overcame Burdin by the help of the emperor: "ejus fretus auxilio!"

[3] GUILL. MALM., *De Gest. reg. Angl.*, i. See PAND. PISAN., ap. MURATORI, iii. p. 418.

[4] "Domino itaque Callisto gloriose præsidente, et raptores Italiæ et Apuliæ perdonante."—SUGER, *loc. cit.*

was of such value to him in the Church's warfare.[1] Cardinal Peter, son of Leo,[2] a monk of Cluny, filled this office in a part of France and in the British Islands, including the Orkneys.[3] Bishop Gerard of Angoulême, exercised the same functions in the five provinces of Aquitaine and Bretagne;[4] and Conon of Palestrina, so long the right arm of the legitimate papacy, continued to hold his former position in the provinces of France, properly so called.[5] In his apostolic journeys, Conon was accompanied[6] by William of Champeaux, Bishop of Châlons, surnamed the *pillar of doctors*,[7] and who, in the conferences with the emperor, had been the pillar of the Church. They together held a provincial council at Beauvais, where, on account of innumerable miracles, they canonised the holy monk, Arnoul of Soissons, so long Gregory VIII.'s legate and auxiliary in Flanders. William of Champeaux died shortly afterwards;[8] but his death did not prevent the legate Conon from holding another council at Soissons in the spring of 1121, where he pronounced a first sentence against Pierre Abélard, the celebrated and ungrateful pupil of William of Champeaux, whose appearance and whose doctrines presented to the Church a new species of enemy to be fought and vanquished.[9]

[1] "Apostolici culminis securitate potitus, libera auctoritate, qua Romanum pontificem niti æquum esse probatur, quaquaversum per legatos suos utebatur."—EADM., *Hist. novor.*, b. v. p. 99.

[2] He who was afterwards anti-pope under the name of Anacletus II.

[3] EADM., *loc. cit.*

[4] Dol, Tours, Bourges, Bordeaux, and Auch, by a bull of October 16, 1120.—Ap. PAGI, *Crit.*, c. 21.

[5] Rheims, Sens, and Rouen.

[6] "Habens secum velut magnum auxiliatorem . . ."—*Chron. Maur.*, p. 372.

[7] "Columna doctorum."—*Vit. S. Arnulfi* in D'ACHÉRY, *Spicil.* and *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1311, where may be seen very curious details of the procedure followed by the bishops for this canonisation.—Cf. D'ACHÉRY, *Spicil.*, vol. i. p. 633, in *not.*, folio ed.

[8] January 1121.

[9] What relates to this early history of Abélard will be found further on.

CHAPTER XIV

THE PAPACY RECONCILED TO THE EMPIRE

Adalbert, named legate by Calixtus, organises the party of resistance.—The armies face each other on the banks of the Mein, 1121.—A diet convoked at Würzburg.—Admirable conduct of the confederated princes.—Letter of Calixtus to Henry V.—Assembly and treaty at Worms.—Grand spectacle on the banks of the Rhine.—Joy of Calixtus equal to that of the nation.—Œcumenical Council at the Lateran.—Consequences of the peace between the pope and emperor.—Erroneous value placed on the agreement of Worms.—What would have happened if the papacy had not won the victory.—Great champions of the Church.—Pagan Rome contrasted with Christian Rome.—Private life of the monks in different monasteries.—Monks of Bec philosophers, grammarians, and *savants*.—William of Champeaux and the schools of Paris to which foreigners flocked.—Foundation of the University of Cambridge.—Jurisconsults, physicians, and historians in monasteries.—Cloistered life specially tempting to the higher classes.—The abbey called Mont-des-Anges in Unterwald.—Osmund, Mainsende, and their son and biographer.—The abbey of Fontevrault a refuge for high-born widows.—Baudouin, Count of Flanders, becomes a monk of St. Bertin.—Foundation of the abbey of Kloster-Neubourg, near Vienna.—Otho, Bishop of Bamberg, the restorer and founder of abbeys.—Money collected to re-establish ruined monasteries.—The Earl of Lothian at Tiron.—Projects of the Emperor Henry V. against the kingdom of France.—France, in the time of Louis le Gros and Suger, was called the Queen of nations.—Greatness of the abbeys of Cluny and of Monte Cassino.—The orders of monks objects of envy and hatred to princes and even to bishops.—A monk of Monte Cassino undertakes the defence of Monastic Orders, which are also avenged by Pope Calixtus II.

FROM this time France and England, as well as the whole of Italy, recognised the great pope who had lately presided at Rheims over the solemn assize of Christendom. Schism, in losing Burdin, had lost its centre. The emperor alone now remained to be subdued. Left alone at Yvoi (1119)

after the miscarriage of the conference of Mouzon, oppressed by the sentence of excommunication pronounced at Rheims, the most solemn ever directed against any sovereign, Henry went, sad and solitary, to spend Christmas at Worms,[1] a town deeply devoted to his cause. The princes had deserted the imperial court; the small number of bishops who had remained with the emperor diminished day by day. Bishop Burckhard of Munster, the most devoted of his creatures, who had advised Pascal's imprisonment, had died on an embassy to Constantinople, whither he had gone to negotiate with the Byzantine Court[2] in Henry's favour. The Archbishop of Trèves, hitherto neutral, had joined Calixtus;[3] the Bishop of Strasburg, Vice-Chancellor of the empire, had submitted to the pope as soon as he heard of the decrees of Rheims. The emperor, instead of trying to win back the prelate, sent him into exile,[4] where he was equally ill-treated by the penitent bishops of Welpire and of Worms,[5] who had been driven from their sees, and by the Bishop of Liège. This diocese was then one of the largest in the empire; it possessed the most flourishing schools,[6] and passed for the most powerful, on account of the number and nobility of its feudatories. It had served as a refuge to Henry IV., and had always been considered as the chief centre of the schism. Having become vacant by the death of Olbert, one of the most ardent partisans of the imperial cause, the see was given by the emperor to Archdeacon Alexander of Juliers, who had brought him the crosier and ring of the late bishop.[7]

[1] "Natale Domini Wormatiæ non imperialiter celebravit."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1120.

[2] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1121; STENTZEL, i. 695.

[3] See above. Cf. GERVAIS, i. 302.

[4] STENTZEL, *ibid.*, ex MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Collect.*, i. p. 676.

[5] *Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1121.

[6] "Leodium civitas . . . studiis litterarum præ ceteris apprime famosa."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1117.

[7] It is said that Alexander paid the emperor seven thousand livres of silver to obtain the dignity.—CHAPEAUVILLE, *Gest. Episc. Leodensium*, vol. ii. c. 21; ap. *Concil.*, xii. 1308.

But the chapter, encouraged by the metropolitan, Frederic of Cologne, would not recognise the choice, and elected their provost, Frederic, brother of the Count of Namur, whom Pope Calixtus consecrated at the Council of Rheims. A bloody war resulted, in which was repeated the great struggle then tearing the empire to pieces. The vast diocese of Liège, extending through Brabant and Lorraine, was cruelly ravaged. The Duke of Brabant, the Counts of Düren and Montaigu, and the greater part of the immediate vassals of the bishopric,[1] fought for the imperial candidate. But the Counts of Namur, of Limbourg, and of Fauquemont, nearly the whole city of Liège, an immense majority of the clergy, and all the abbeys,[2] took part with the bishop-elect, who represented the cause of ecclesiastical liberty. Abbot Rodolph of St. Frond was especially distinguished for the zeal and steadiness with which he opposed the partisans of Alexander and the emperor; just as twelve years previously he had nobly striven, even to the point of suffering exile and all kinds of perils, to defend freedom of election in his own monastery, against the excommunicated candidate whom the emperor wished to introduce there. This time he again braved persecution by maintaining the same cause in his own diocese. Rather than communicate with the imperialists, he chose to abandon his monastery and take refuge at Cologne.[3] Frederic, thanks to the sword of his brother, the Count of Namur, finally triumphed, and received his rival publicly as a penitent; but he died shortly after, poisoned by the schismatics, and honoured as a martyr by all Catholics.[4] These

[1] "Pene tota familia Ecclesiæ cum suis viribus."—CHAPEAUVILLE, *Gest. Episc. Leodensium*, vol. ii. c. 21; ap. *Concil.*, xii. 1308.

[2] "Civitas fere tota et omnes episcopatus abbates."—*Ibid.* "De archidiaconis et præpositis meliores et plurimi, clerus quam plurimus."—*Chron. Rudal. abb.* S. Trudonis in *Spicileg.*, ii. p. 698.

[3] See the very curious and detailed account of Abbot Rodolph's trials in 1107 and 1119, in the *Chronicle of St. Frond*, edited by himself, in *Spicil.*, vol. ii. p. 686 *et seq.*

[4] *Act. SS. Bolland.*, May 27. We are astonished to find nothing about

local wars were carried on in all the German States with various results and with periods of hesitation, and of overtures which, for the moment, gave hope of reconciliation between the emperor and the Saxon princes, now weary of conflict.[1] But the great Archbishop Adalbert, whom Calixtus had appointed legate, succeeded in organising and keeping up a defence, winning,[2] by his energy and eloquence, both bishops and princes to his cause, and communicating to the whole north of Germany a unanimous impulse of opposition to the emperor. In concert with Duke Lothaire and other Saxon princes, the archbishop busied himself in making canonical elections to the vacant sees, and especially to those of Magdeburg and Münster, of men rejected by the imperialists on account of their steady devotion to the liberty of the Church, but whom he eagerly undertook to consecrate.[3] In this state of affairs Henry resolved to make a last attempt; collecting all his forces, he besieged Mayence, as if he hoped to smother in the metropolitan stronghold those flames of resistance which Adalbert had kindled. But the archbishop redoubled his exertions. Having succeeded in interesting all orthodox Germany in the fate of this important city,[4] he hurried back from Saxony at the head of a considerable number of troops to defend it. The two armies came in sight of each other on the banks of the Mein in the middle

this bull in the two histories of Liège, published by M. le Baron de Gerlache and M. L. Polain.

[1] We must again refer to Gervais for details of the wars and negotiations during the years 1120 and 1121, carefully excepting the calumnious and altogether unsupported imputations made by this historian upon Adalbert.

[2] "Pontifices ac principes totius Saxoniæ pro utilitalibus matris Ecclesiæ frequenter convocat . . . vir eloquens et primatum in Cisalpinis partibus multi firmiter tenens."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1121.

[3] "Litteris ac legationibus papæ roborati cathedris vacantibus canonicæ pastores elegerunt quos. . . . Mogontino præsule . . . probabiliter et Ecclesiastica libertate consecrari fecerunt . . . contra voluntatem imperatoris restituunt."—*Ibid.*, 1120, 1121.

[4] "Ad defensionem metropolis totius Germaniæ animos omnium catholicam obedientiam profitentium tandem excitat."—*Ibid.*

of June 1121. Henry was at last obliged to acknowledge the impossibility of continuing the struggle; the moment was one of bitter humiliation on all sides. Adalbert, his detested rival, the principal object of his hatred, was there with the half of Germany ranged in battle against him. Burdin, as will be remembered, had fallen from the pontifical throne where the emperor had seated him. His brother-in-law, William, the only son of the King of England, whose tyrannical disposition towards his future subjects had already made itself manifest, had just perished with his half-sister and three hundred companions by the wreck of his ship upon a rock near the Norman coast during a perfectly calm night.[1] The world had seen in this terrible catastrophe a striking instance of divine justice. "Your William," wrote a certain monk, "was dreaming of the greatness of his future royalty;[2] but God said to him, Not so, impious prince—not so; and instead of being encircled by the golden crown, his head was crushed against the rocks of the sea."[3]

During this time, in all the churches of Germany fasts were held, and fervent prayers and solemn processions were made for the safety of Mayence and the restoration of peace. At the most critical juncture the pope's legates arrived. Calixtus, far from being intoxicated by his triumph at Rome, or inclined to abuse it, still showed himself as ready to treat as before the excommunication at Rheims: he displayed the most conciliatory disposition, and the most ardent desire that under his pontificate peace should be made throughout the Christian universe.[4] Two of his

[1] November 25, 1120.

[2] "Quæ res multorum mentes exterruit atque turbavit et de occultis justi Dei judiciis in admirationem concussit."—EADM., *Hist. nov.*, b. 5, *ad fin.*

[3] "Ille de regno futuro cogitabat, Deus autem dicebat: Non sic, impie, non sic: contigit autem ei quod pro corona auri, rupibus marinis capite scinderetur."—HENRIC. HUNTINGDON., Ep. *de contempt. mundi* in *Anglia sacra*, ii. 696; cited by THIERRY, *Conquête de l'Angleterre*.

[4] "Per litteras et nuntios vestros cognovimus circa hæc maxime semper

cardinals, Lambert of Ostia and Gregory, both of whom were destined to occupy the pontifical throne after him,[1] and who had already been in communication with Henry V., were commissioned, immediately after Burdin's capture, to return to Germany,[2] and to neglect nothing needful to attain the object of the pope's noble ambition. Their influence certainly contributed to the prevalence of those pacific dispositions which were plainly shown by the great personages of both armies, and which induced them, instead of fighting, to approach each other with a desire to arrange terms of accommodation.[3]

The emperor was obliged to yield to this irresistible movement, and consent that the solution of the important question in debate between the Church and the empire should be confided to twenty-five princes, chosen among those who were supposed to be most influenced by the fear of God; twelve from his party, and twelve from that of the Church.[4] A general diet was convoked at Würzburg for St. Michael's Day (1121), in order to conclude this much-desired peace.

When the two armies found themselves within a day's march of each other on the banks of the Wernitz, there was,

versari vestræ pietatis desideria, ut Apostolica dispensatione vestris potissimum diebus pax et concordia descenderent in universum mundum."—Ep. ADALB. ad *Calixt. Ampl. Collect.*, vol. i. p. 671.

[1] They had for a colleague Saxo, cardinal-priest of St. Stephen.

[2] They returned to Rome at the end of August 1121.—Cf. PAND. PISAN. and FALCO BENEVENT., ap. PAGI, *Crit.*, ann. 1121, c. 6 and 9, whence it is natural to conclude that they took part in the negotiations of the months of June and July in Germany. Gervais, who willingly represents in a false light the Church's position at the end of the contest, makes no mention of this first mission of the three legates.

[3] "Missis utrimque quibusdam sapientissimis atque religiosis proceribus, de concordia sua scilicet fraterna honorabiliter tractare cœperunt."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1121.

[4] "Mentibus universorum tam in uno divinæ voluntatis assensu connexis . . . ut ipse præsens negocium non suo, sed optimatum utriusque partis arbitrio terminandum decreverit . . . ex utraque parte XII primates, quorum corda timor Dei possidens inveteratam discordiam inter regnum et sacerdotium sedare . . . resistens sufficeret."—*Ibid.*

indeed, considerable temptation to renew hostilities ;[1] but the emperor this time remained faithful to his oath, and consented that all questions should be settled according to the princes' decision.[2] The latter, both lay and ecclesiastic, but headed by the bishops,[3] showed themselves worthy of their high mission ; they displayed a spirit of justice, moderation, and generosity, which testified to their greatness of soul and their high intelligence, and proves how well they were fitted to decide the destinies of their country, and to interpose as mediators between the Church and the sovereign,[4] both of whom they had served so bravely. Faithful to the spirit of the conventions agreed to by the emperor and the pope's plenipotentiaries at Strasburg, they began by decreeing, under pain of death, the commencement of a general and complete peace, the reciprocal restitution of all domains and heritages usurped from the royal revenue, from the Church, or from the lawful heirs ; the re-establishment of justice and of the privileges of each order ;[5] and the rigorous prosecution of robbers. Thus the temporal interests of the empire were provided for wisely and justly ; but the spiritual question, the chief cause of the quarrel, still

[1] "Licet nonnulli pacem odientes scandala nova veteribus superseminare tentaverunt."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, ann. 1121.

[2] "Imperator sponsionis suæ non immemor . . . quantum . . . non sui arbitrio . . . sed juxta senatusconsultum concludi per omnia in omnibus concessit."—*Ibid.*

[3] We cannot find anywhere a list of these nobles ; to admit with Gervais (vol. i. p. 324, note 3) that the princes whose decision was acknowledged as sovereign were all, or nearly all, laymen, would be to disregard all the indications of history, and all the customs of the time, especially in Germany. Besides, we see in *Charton*, vol. i. p. 671, and *Chron. Ursperg.*, p. 1121, that Adalbert and Otho of Bamberg had an important share in the proceedings.

[4] STENTZEL (i. 701) and GERVAIS (i. 330) have well shown the importance and the merits of the princes' interference on this occasion ; but we think that they have insisted too much on the novelty of such an intervention, numerous examples of which are supplied by the previous history of Germany and of all the European States.

[5] "Omnique personæ vel conditioni propriam adjudicatam est justitiam."—*Chron. Ursperg.*

remained to be settled. The custom of investiture was, in the eyes of most of the lay nobles, an hereditary appanage of the imperial dignity; and when Archbishop Adalbert had explained the law of the Church, he found himself considered by many as the destroyer of the empire.[1] It was then that those princes to whom the emperor had intrusted his prerogatives, those all-powerful warriors who had become the arbitrators of the spiritual and temporal future of the empire, gave the most astonishing proof of their moderation and true wisdom by abstaining from judging this aspect of the cause, and leaving it to the pope to decide in a general council all that referred to investitures and to the imperial excommunication. Guided by the fear of God, they chose to refer to the judgment of the Holy Spirit a question which they found insoluble by means of purely human skill.[2] They contented themselves, therefore, with advising the emperor never to lose sight of the obedience due to the Holy See,[3] and with promising solemnly that they would all endeavour sincerely to bring about his reconciliation with the Church, and to make the settlement of the question of investitures compatible with the honour of the imperial crown.[4] This

[1] "Tam imperium quam imperator tanquam hereditario quodam jure baculum et annulum possidere volebant, pro quibus universa laicarum multitudo imperii nos destructores inclamabat."—Ep. ADALB., *ad Pap.*, ap. MARTÈNE, *loc. cit.* It is evident that this *unanimity* must not be taken *literally*, nor applied to all the nobles, since at least half of them had for fifty years been fighting against the imperial right of investiture. If it had existed, this right would certainly not have been abandoned by universal consent in the treaty which was the result of these negotiations.

[2] "De verbo autem excommunicationis . . . nihil est definitum, tamen ad Apostolicam audientiam concorditer in divino timore dilatum . . . quatenus indicto per auctoritatem Apostolicam generali concilio quæcumque, humano non possent Spiritus Dei judicio terminarentur."—*Chron. Urspery., loc. cit.* "Judicio et consilio domini Apostolici, causam imperatoris determinandam reservantes."—*Chron. Hildesheim.*, ann. 1121.

[3] This *formula pacis* contains the bases of the accommodation such as they were no doubt submitted to the pope, and communicated to the absent princes.—Cf. JERVAIS, i. 329; STENTZEL, i. 700.

[4] "Principes sine dolo et sine dissimulatione elaborare intendunt, ut in hoc regnum honorem suum retineat."—*Formula pacis, loc. cit.*

was not all; they ordered that the bishops lawfully elected and consecrated by Adalbert should be maintained or established in their sees. Catholics were authorised to communicate provisionally with the emperor, until an answer should arrive from Rome;[1] but previously the princes engaged to interpose their authority in case of the emperor attempting to avenge, upon any one, injuries received during the war; and they did not separate until they had sworn to maintain the bases of an accommodation decided upon among themselves, even if the emperor should violate them.[2] The Bishop of Spire and the Abbot of Fulda were sent to Rome with the results of the conference: they returned at the beginning of 1122, with the three cardinals, Lambert, Gregory, and Saxo, who had already, in the preceding year, testified to the pacific intentions of Calixtus.[3] They arrived in time to prevent the peace from being again disturbed on the subject of a contested election to the see of Würzburg, where the emperor had hastened to use once more his contested right of investiture in favour of a candidate of his own choosing, Count Gebhard of Neisseburg. Archbishop Adalbert, together with most of the princes, and even with Henry's two nephews,[4] supported, in opposition to Gebhard, a more fitting candidate in the person of the deacon Rudiger,[5]

[1] "Donec id fiat, episcopi et omnes catholici, sine ulla injuria et periculo communionem suam custodiant."

[2] "Si autem imperator hoc consilium præterierit, principes sicut ad invicem fidem dederunt, ita eam observent." We do not know what foundation Gervais has for saying (i. 331) that they made a similar engagement with regard to the pope; this is a gratuitous and certainly absurd assertion, since they were referring the question to the pope's decision.

[3] See, as to the double journey of these three legates, PAGI, *Crit.*, ann. 1122, c. 9.

[4] "Indignatus ab imperatore suo avunculo suo discedere."—*Chron. Urspperg., loc. cit.* These were Frederic, Duke of Suabia, and Conrad, Duke of Franconia, the latter especially interested in the question, because his duchy had been given him at the expense of the see of Würzburg.

[5] Gervais (i. 338) owns that Rudiger was better fitted for the bishopric than Gebhard, and that the details of the dispute are obscure, which does

who was consecrated in the Abbey of Schwartzach. The legates, in spite of the emperor,[1] acknowledged the newly elected bishop, and Henry was obliged to endure this contradiction, tempered, indeed, by the affectionate letters which they brought him from Pope Calixtus, in which the pope said that they ought to treat with each other, not only as pontiff and monarch, but as relatives[2] nearer to each other by the ties of blood than any of their predecessors had been. "The Church," said the pope, "has no desire to rob you of any of your rights, but, like a mother, gives you freely all that belongs to her. Nor does she desire to claim the glory of your empire. We wish only to serve God and to do justice. Return therefore to your true self, and consider what you have become. Do not trust in the pride of wickedness, for God resists the proud. You have soldiers on your side, but the Church has the King of kings; she has also the holy apostles Peter and Paul, who are her lords and patrons. Give up, then, what does not belong to your office, that you may the better fulfil it. Let the Church have what is Christ's, and let Cæsar keep what is his own. Let each be content with his share, and let those to whom all look for justice be careful not to encroach upon the rights of others. If, by the advice of wise and religious men, you listen to and obey us, you will give joy to God and to the world, and you will add eternal glory to your imperial crown. You will bind us and all the Church to you by the bonds of such love that you will appear to all as a true king and true emperor. But if you prefer the counsels of fools and flatterers, who desire to rule over you, if you refuse to God and the Church the honour which is

not hinder him from blindly following the interested version of the imperialist candidate in *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 335, and profiting by it to accuse Archbishop Adalbert.

[1] "Contra voluntatem imperatoris per auctoritatem archiepiscopi Adalberti ceterorumque legatorum papæ."—*Chron. Ursperg.*, *loc. cit.*

[2] The Empress Agnes, grandmother of Henry V., was niece of Count Raymond, grandfather of Calixtus II.

their due, we will provide for the needs of the Church by the ministry of wise and good men, but it will be to your hurt, for things cannot remain as they are." [1]

The apostolic legates, after having consulted with Adalbert of Mayence, and seconded by his anxiety for peace,[2] succeeded in calming the irritation produced on both sides by the affair of Würzburg,[3] and convoked, for the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin, a general assembly, to which were invited, by letters breathing the most sincere desire for peace [4] and concord, the emperor, the prelates, the monks, and the learned clerks of Germany, and even of France.[5] This assembly was held at Worms; and while the legates, the emperor, and the princes were deliberating in the city, the immense crowd which formed their *cortège* encamped on the banks of the Rhine. The deliberations lasted more

[1] "Nihil, Henrice, de tuo jure vindicare sibi quæret Ecclesia, quæ sicut mater sua omnibus gratuito administrat. Nec regni nec imperii gloriam affectamus, sed soli Deo in Ecclesiæ suæ justitia deservire optamus. Redi ergo ad te ipsum, redi . . . habes milites adjutores tuos : habet Ecclesia Regem regum . . . obtineat Ecclesia quod Christi est, habeat imperatore quod suum est . . . sit pars utraque contenta suo officio, nec sibi ad invicem ambitione aliqua sua usurpent, qui debent omnibus justitiam observare . . . Hos es totam Ecclesiam ita tibi nexibus dilectionis divincies . . . quod si stultorum et imperare tibi volentium adulationibus . . . anhæseris . . . Ecclesiæ Dei curabimus provideri, quoniam sic esse diutius non valemus."—Letter of February 19, 1122. NEUGART, *Cod. Dipl.*, ii. 841.

[2] STENTZEL, here more just than Gervais, acknowledges that Adalbert was the mediator of this wished-for peace.—Vol. i. p. 710, note 57.

[3] Cf. Ep. *Adalb. ad Calixt.*, ap. MART., *loc. cit.* "Benignus et amator Jesus per industriam servorum suorum . . . legatorum qui tunc Moguntiæ morabant, immo per habitatem in eis Spiritum suum, spiritum principum paci contrarium auferre caritatemque in eorum cordibus diffundere cœpit." —*Chron. Ursp.*, *loc. cit.*

[4] *Cod. Udalr.*, pp. 304, 331, 332.

[5] "Omnibus Galliarum archiepiscopis, abbatibus, monachis, clericis præcipue in sacris Scripturis eruditis, et omnibus principibus."—*Ibid.* It does not appear that any French prince or prelate responded to this invitation; and it seems to us probable that the word *Galliarum* arises from the error of a copyist, who completed the word from the initial G, intended for *Germaniæ*. Such errors in MSS. are not rare.

than a week, amidst general anxiety.[1] But at last, He who holds the hearts of kings in His hand, humbled, beyond all hope, the pride of the emperor, and bowed him to the yoke of apostolic obedience.[2] Henry V. renounced the famous right of investiture which his predecessors had so long exercised, and which he had so often vowed he would abandon only with his life.[3] On September 23, 1122, the treaty, so famous in history under the name of the *Concordat of Worms*, was concluded by the exchange of two solemn engagements, made by the pope and the emperor, in the name of the holy and indivisible Trinity. The following is the engagement signed by the emperor: "I, Henry, by the grace of God august Emperor of the Romans, for the love of God, of the holy Roman Church, and of Pope Calixtus, and for the good of my soul, do give up to God, to His holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to the holy Catholic Church, all rights of investiture by the crosier and ring; and I consent that, in all churches of my empire, elections shall be canonical, and consecrations free. I restore to the holy Roman Church all her possessions and regalia, which, since the beginning of this quarrel, either in my father's time or in my own, have been taken from her, and which I have retained; and I will cause to be faithfully restored, according to the advice and judgment of the princes, those which I do not myself possess. I will do the same for the possessions[4]

[1] "Incredibile memoratum est quam prudenti, quam instanti, quamque per omnia sollicito cunctorum procerum consilio pro pace et concordia certatum sit."—*Chron. Ursp.*

[2] "Donec ipsi in cujus manu cor regis est omnem animositatem imperatoris sub Apostolicam obedientiam causa manu Ecclesiæ, etiam ultra spem plurimorum inflexit."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Quæ tanto tempore reges Teutonici administraverant, quæque ipse, ne regni imminuereter honor, nunquam vita comite se dimissurum proposuerat."—*Ibid.*

[4] After having stipulated the restitution, pure and simple, of possessions and regalia (that is, royal rights, such as military service, tolls, &c.) to the Roman Church, he reserves to himself, with regard to the other churches, the regalia of which the pope's document authorised him to give investiture by the sceptre.

of the other churches, and of the princes and other clerks and laymen, which have been seized during this war. I grant a true peace to Pope Calixtus, to the holy Roman Church, and to all those who are, or who have been, of her party. I will aid her faithfully when she shall demand it of me; and whenever she shall bring a complaint to me I will render her due justice."

This act bore, immediately after the emperor's signature, that of his most redoubtable opponent, Adalbert, Archbishop of Mayence; and it was revised and sealed with the great golden seal by the very man who had always so resolutely contended with Henry—by Frederic, Archbishop of Cologne, Chancellor of the kingdom of Italy.[1]

The document drawn up in the pope's name was thus expressed: "I, Calixtus, servant of the servants of God, I grant to you, my dear son Henry, by the grace of God august Emperor of the Romans, that the election of bishops and abbots of the Germanic kingdom shall be made in your presence, without simony or any violence, so that, if any dispute arise between the competitors, you may give your consent and protection to the one who best merits them, by the advice of the metropolitan and the bishops of the diocese. The elect may then receive from you the investiture of regalia by the sceptre (except those which are known to belong to the Roman Church), and he shall do to you, in return, the services to which you have a right: any one who has been consecrated in another part of the empire may receive the regalia from you by the sceptre within the space of six months.[2] You may bring complaints before me, and I will give you help according to the duty of my

[1] *Autograph. Vatican.* ap. BARON., ann. 1122.

[2] "Teutonici regni, qui ad regnum pertinent;" that is to say, of the German kingdom, and not of such other countries as Italy, Burgundy, or the kingdom of Arles, which all belonged to the Holy Roman Empire, but did not form parts of Germany. The Emperor, on the other hand, had granted freedom of election *in omnibus imperii mei partibus.*—Cf. GERVAIS, i. 346.

office. I grant you a true peace, both to you and to all those who are, or have been, of your party." [1]

This great act was consummated with all the publicity which was then thought suitable for the events of political life, and in presence of all the freemen who constituted the Germanic nation.[2]

[1] From these stipulations it appears that, in Germany, the prelates who had been freely elected were to receive the investiture of regalia by the sceptre before being consecrated, but the crosier and ring from the consecrator. In Italy, and elsewhere, prelates were consecrated before being invested by the sceptre. At the same time, there is not, according to Gervais, a single instance of an Italian prelate who went to seek this investiture from the emperor.

[2] We may here remind the reader that, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Germanic nation consisted of seven categories or classes, designated by the name of *Heerschilde* or Shields, which, when assembled, formed the general diets and those of election :—

1. The elective *king*, who took the title of *emperor*, after being consecrated to that office by the pope.

2. The ecclesiastical princes, bishops, or abbots, who, as to temporal matters, could be vassals only to the king.

3. Dukes, who could be vassals to the ecclesiastical princes.

4. Counts and free barons, equal in rank to the dukes, but able to be their vassals by holding some of their lands in fief. The first three classes composed the higher nobility (*der höhere Adel*), which have since been called the *immediate* princes and seigneurs. It is probable that they alone took part in the election of kings.

5. The *Mittelfreie*, or bannerets, who did not belong by birth to the higher nobility, but who could have freemen for vassals; these formed the ordinary nobility.

6. The simple knights, or nobles, without vassals (*ministeriales*).

7. The freemen (*ingenui*), vassals of the higher and middle nobility, but not serfs. There were many nobles in the cities; but the citizens, who were not noble, though already very influential, from their wealth and warlike spirit, did not form part of the political body of the empire until later, when *imperial cities* were created. The country people in general were attached to the land (*Leibeigener*), with a regulated system of rights, services, and jurisdiction, which rendered their condition entirely different from that of serfdom, as we have seen it in Russia. There were also peasants who were quite free. The six *Heerschilde* generally assembled about the king at the three great festivals of Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide.

The duchies, which represented the ancient races of the Teutonic nation, had also their individual diets. There were seven of them :

The world has rarely seen a nobler or more touching spectacle than that witnessed by the banks of the Rhine, when princes, counts, bishops, knights, monks, priests, soldiers, and citizens met in the vast plain near Worms, through which flows the most beautiful river of Europe. Amidst this innumerable multitude,[1] the emperor Henry V. appeared, and humbling himself in the presence of all for the love of Christ, gave to the pope's vicegerent,[2] and through him to Christ Himself, the deed by which he surrendered for ever to the Church his ancient right, and received the pope's concession in return.[3] The two documents were read to the assembled crowd;[4] and immediately all the multitude, all the Catholic army, moved by one impulse, fell upon their knees in a transport of joy, to thank God for the conclusion of peace, while Cardinal Lambert of Ostia gave absolution to the emperor and his followers, and then the kiss of peace and the holy communion.[5]

After the emperor had sworn, between the hands of the legate, that he would observe all the conditions of the treaties, he again received the oath of fidelity from the princes—an oath from which they had been released by the

Franconia, Saxony, Suabia, Bavaria, Carinthia, and Upper and Lower Lorraine. There were six archbishoprics (Mayence, Cologne, Trèves, Magdeburg, Salzburg, and Bremen), and thirty-five bishoprics.—GIEHHORN, *Deutsche Staats und Rechts Geschichte*, § 294; STENTZEL, vol. i. p. 727 to 735; PLEFFEL, *Abridgement of Public Law in Germany; Remarks on the Fifth and Sixth Periods.*

[1] "Propter infinitæ multitudinis conventum loco campestri juxta Rhenum."—*Chron. Ursp., loc. cit.*

[2] "Ostiensem episcopum vicem domini Apostolici per omnia tenentem."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Qualiter . . . humiliatus pro Christi coram multitudine maxima abnegaverit, et in manus Episcopi . . . ac per ipsum domino . . . suæque in perpetuum jus Ecclesiæ dimiserit, rursusque quale sibi . . . auctoritas apostolica concesserit."—*Ibid.*

[4] "Scripta atque rescripta . . . lecta sunt, data et accepta."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Post multimodas laudes rerum Gubernatori redditas, celebratis a domno Ostiensi divinis sacramentis, inter quæ . . . cum pacis osculo sanctaque communione plenissime reconciliavit. . . . Discessum est ab omnibus cum infinita lætitia."—*Ibid.* Cf. GERVAIS, i. 349.

Council of Rheims—and swore to them, in his turn, that he would respect their persons, their possessions, and their right to hold courts of justice.[1] The meeting separated with universal satisfaction; and the emperor went to Bamberg[2] to collect the suffrages of those princes who had been unable to go to Worms. Their votes were unanimous; and with their consent, Henry gave, for the first time, investiture of regalia by the sceptre agreeably to the apostolic authorisation, to the new abbot of Fulda, regularly and freely elected by the princes.[3] Thence the emperor sent a solemn embassy with rich presents to Calixtus as his dear cousin.[4] As to the anti-pope Burdin, nothing was said of him; not a voice was raised in favour of the unfortunate man who had consented to serve as instrument in the degradation of the Church and the re-establishment of all the abuses destroyed by Gregory VII. According to the usual course of earthly justice, Burdin was betrayed and sacrificed by those very men for whom he had betrayed and sacrificed the Church.

Calixtus felt a joy neither less lively nor less legitimate than that which spread through Germany. For the active and unconquerable energy which he had displayed against imperial usurpation, both before and after his accession to the papal throne, the great pontiff had substituted, at the right moment, a spirit of conciliation and mercy, which had won for him a complete victory. He answered Henry's letter in the most affectionate terms, congratulating him on having returned, after so long an estrangement, into the bosom of the Church, and on having humbly obeyed his

[1] *Cod. Udalr.*, No. 309; explained by GERVAIS, i. 349.

[2] November 11, 1122.

[3] "Cum consensu præsentium principum electione regulari præmissa . . . ejusdem congregationis frater . . . juxta privilegium præscriptum regalia vel fiscalia eidem cœnobio pertinentia ab imperatore suscepit."—*Chron. Ursp.*, *loc. cit.*

[4] "Domno Apostolico Calixto, consanguineo scilicet jam sibi mitissimo."—*Ibid.*

salutary commands.[1] "We open to you," he said, "as to a son of St. Peter, our paternal arms, and we are the more desirous to cherish your person and to honour your crown, because you have obeyed the Roman Church more devoutly than your predecessors, and are more closely united to us by ties of blood. Act so, therefore, dear son, that we may be united in the Lord, and reflect how much evil this long discord between the Church and the empire has done to the faithful throughout Europe, and how much good our concord may do with God's help. . . . Our brothers, the bishops, cardinals, and all the Roman clergy, join with us to salute you, your princes, and your barons."[2]

Finally, in order to impress upon the peace the seal of the most solemn confirmation, Calixtus II. summoned to the Lateran an Œcumenical Council, the first which had ever met at Rome.[3] The council was opened in Lent 1123 (March 18), and almost all the prelates of Christendom were present at it[4]—thirty-two cardinals, more than three hundred bishops, and six hundred abbots[5] gathered from all countries of the Christian world. The pope having caused the Concordat of Worms to be read to this august and immense assembly, it was ratified and approved unanimously by the thousand prelates.[6] Calixtus, by the advice of the council, then pronounced the absolution of the emperor from the sentence of excommunication which had

[1] "Te jamdudum nimium reluctantem. . . ."—Letter of December 13, 1122, in *Conc.*, xii. 1331.

[2] "Nos ergo te in B. Petri filium paternæ affectionis brachiis te suscipimus. . . . Age ergo, fili carissime . . . perpendat imperialis excellentia tua, quantum diuturna, &c. . . . Europæ fidelibus intulerit detrimentum." —*Ibid.*

[3] It is counted as the ninth Œcumenical Council and the first of the Lateran in the West.—FLEURY, b. 67, No. 31; *Hist. litt.*, vol. x. p. 527.

[4] See their names at the bottom of the deed as to metropolitan jurisdiction in Corsica.—*Conc.*, xii. 1342.

[5] SIMEON DUNELM., *De Gest. Angl.*, ann. 1122. "Ultra montanos omnes fere episcopos, et archiepiscopos, et abbates, et totius ut ita dicam Italiæ ecclesiarum pastores."—FALCO BENEVENT., *Chron.*, ann. 1123.

[6] The exact number, according to PANDULPH. PISAN., was 997.

been passed upon him by the four hundred and twenty-seven prelates of the Council of Rheims;[1] he canonised the holy monk Gebhard, Bishop of Constance, who had so long been the indomitable champion of the liberty of the Church in Germany against Henry IV. and Henry V.;[2] finally, he published twenty-two canons, intended, like those of Rheims, to consolidate the new conquests made in the cause of the Church's liberty and independence, to guarantee her property, and to maintain the freedom and purity of her ministers. By the 21st of these canons, the marriage of priests, always prohibited in the Latin Church, but first uprooted by Gregory VII., received a final blow; the fact of entering holy orders was declared an absolute bar to marriage.[3] The one which possessed most novelty among these decrees, assimilated, by a conception worthy of such an epoch and such an assembly, the expeditions made against the Moors in Spain to those pilgrimages to the Holy Land undertaken to defend Christian nations and to destroy infidel tyranny.[4] What was truly remarkable was, that amidst great internal conflicts, while the problem of the government of Chris-

[1] SIMEON DUNELM., *loc. cit.*

[2] The bull is in LEIBNITZ, *Script. rer. Brunsw.*, vol. ii. p. 2, and in *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1340. Gebhard or Conrad was a monk of Hirschau, and died in 1110.

[3] "Presbyteris, diaconibus, subdiaconibus . . . matrimonia contrahere penitus interdicimus: contracta quoque matrimonia ab hujusmodi personis disjungi judicamus"—Can. xxi. Until then the prohibition had had no penalty attached to it, except the deposition of the prevaricatory priest; the nullity of these marriages had not been explicitly pronounced.

[4] "Ad Christianam gentem defendendam et tyrannidem infidelium debellandam."—Can. ii. This order is confirmed in Calixtus's bull of April 2, 1122 (in *Concil.*, vol. xii. p. 1281), by which he constituted Oldegamus his legate in Spain, Archbishop of Tarragona, "quia exercitum vestrum, per nos, ut desideraremus, visitare nequimus." Calixtus felt special interest in Spain; he was, in fact, uncle of Alfonso VII., the young King of Castile, and had a special devotion for St. James of Compostello, patron of Spain; he had made the sanctuary of that place a metropolitan bishopric, to which he sent the English pilgrims who were coming to Rome.—GUILL. MALM., 856. A book upon the miracles of St. James is attributed to him (*Hist. litt. de France*, vol. x. p. 532).

tendom was being decided, she was defended without by perpetually recruited armies of Catholic heroes who, in Palestine, under the two Baldwins,[1] and in Castile and Arragon under the two Alfonsos,[2] sometimes by brilliant victories, sometimes by heroic deaths, extended the Church's domain, and glorified the banner of the Cross.

Thus was ended by a loyal and glorious peace the war commenced fifty years previously by Gregory VII. This peace was but a truce, since the Church, we must repeat, can know only truces on earth; but it established, in the social and religious constitution of Christendom, conquests equally valuable and durable. In temporal matters, and in what related to the great German nation, who believed it to be their mission to rebuild, upon the memories and traditions of the pagan empire of Rome, the Christian edifice which has been called the *Holy Roman Empire*, the peace brought about by the will and the power of the allied nobles gave a sovereign importance to the ecclesiastical and secular princes; it was the true sanction of the Germanic constitution, and maintained that fruitful independence of provincial races and of local dynasties which has always specially characterised the German nationality. This peace, also, definitely secured the indispensable alliance of the small states among themselves, and gathered the different fractions of the body politic under the ægis of a royalty

[1] Baldwin I., brother and successor of Godfrey of Bouillon, died in the midst of victory in 1118, and was interred in the Holy Sepulchre; as was also his brother, Baldwin II. du Burg, third King of Jerusalem, victor in the great battle of August 14, 1120, with the wood of the true cross, who, in the same year, held the Council of Naplouse to ask the blessing of God on the conquerors, and extended the same protection, against the abuse of power, to the Saracen as to the Christian women (Can. v. and xiii. in *Concil.* xii. 1317). He was made prisoner in 1123, and released after the great victory of Hiblin. The Pisans, and especially the Venetians, gave most efficient help to the Crusaders.

[2] Alfonso VII. of Castile and Alfonso VI. of Arragon were both aided in their victorious wars with the Moors by French nobles—William, Duke of Aquitaine; Gaston, Viscount of Béarn; Rotrou, Count of Perche; Robert d'Aiguillon, called Burdet; and a number of Norman knights.

elective and responsible, such as Catholic nations have always understood.[1]

This settlement assured the durability of the ecclesiastical principalities, in which, even to their last hour, the government was so beneficent and the people so happy;[2] while it gave a curb to the power of the emperor, and an auxiliary to the ancient and legitimate freedom of the laity in the liberty and independence of bishops, and of the most influential monasteries.

Thanks to this happy revolution, it became for ever impossible to revive that sovereignty, equally absolute in spiritual and in temporal matters, which the Othos, Henry III., Henry IV., and Henry V., all monarchs greedy of absolutism, had constantly tried to appropriate to themselves, and which, if it had unhappily triumphed, would have ended by assimilating itself completely to the monstrous despotism of the pagan Cæsars.

The social organisation of Germany was thus consolidated upon bases conformable at once to the nature of a society enfranchised by Christianity, and to the old spirit of the ancient Germans, such as Tacitus describes them. The modern system of a guardianship exercised by the State over all the doings and all the rights of men had not yet been invented, to the injury of the most inalienable rights of each individual, and of the free development of the soul. Both authority and general liberty were founded at once upon individual power and upon the profitable activity of each member of the political body in his legitimate sphere.[3]

In all that related to the Church, the conquests which the peace of Worms either formally recognised or sanctioned by silence, were yet more valuable and more durable results

[1] This idea is fully expounded by GERVAIS, i. 123 and 153.

[2] We have already quoted the saying so common in Germany before the secularisation of these states, "*Unter dem Krummstab ist es gut leben*" —it is well to live under the crosier.

[3] This is what modern Germans sometimes designate by the name of autonomy.

of her victory. The total independence of the papacy, now for ever freed from all the pretensions which the Byzantine emperors, and, after them, the Carlovingians, the Othos, and the Henrys had set up, either as emperors or as Roman patricians; the confiding of the election of the sovereign pontiff exclusively to the cardinals, and withdrawing it, after the time of Gregory VII., from all ratification by, or influence direct or indirect of, the imperial authority; the general freedom of episcopal and monastic elections throughout the empire, guaranteed by a public concession of the head of the State, and secured from nominations made either for money or at the caprice of kings; such were the immense results obtained. If the obligation to make the election in presence of the emperor (or of his commissioners) secured to him a great influence over the choice in fact, yet in law his arbitrary intervention was annulled, and the divine origin of ecclesiastical authority solemnly recognised. In a word, for the uncontested imperial supremacy in the disposal of ecclesiastical power, such as Henry III. had exercised, there was now substituted the uncontested independence of the Church which Gregory VII. had proclaimed.

Some writers have endeavoured to disparage the value of these results by representing the treaty of Worms as a compromise, and weighing the renunciation of investitures by the emperor against the supposed surrender of the right, which the popes are said to have arrogated to themselves, of disposing as sovereign of ecclesiastical territories and possessions. But this hypothesis, which is entirely gratuitous, rests upon a perfectly false foundation; the Holy See never, in reality, made any claim to the sovereignty of ecclesiastical domains or of regalia in the empire. Pascal II., acting in the name of the Church, showed himself inclined, in the treaty of Sutri, to renounce completely the possession of that appanage which was likely to be abused by being made a bond of servitude; but no pontiff ever

thought of making himself its absolute master, so as to withdraw it from political subjection to the empire; and the most erudite critic may be defied to find in the voluminous collection of letters and decrees of Gregory VII. and his successors, a word which implies the project or even the thought of such a usurpation.

It has been resolved, however, that there must have been a bargain, where, in fact, there was nothing more than a needful distinction. The treaty of Worms sanctioned no bargain: it simply established the essential and too long misunderstood distinction between the bishop as a pontiff and the bishop as a prince or vassal of the empire, between the political duty and the temporal authority of one or the other. And this distinction was marked by the introduction of a new symbol—that is, of the sceptre regarded as an instrument of the investiture given by the emperor; while the old and universally recognised symbols, those of election and consecration,[1] the crosier and ring, were for the future reserved to the sovereign independence of the Church in the spiritual order. The spiritual marriage of the pontiff with his Church, the duty of the shepherd towards his flock, were thus for ever removed from human jurisdiction; the Church never claimed anything more. She had admitted this distinction fifteen years before, at the time of the reconciliation between St. Anselm and the

[1] The following passage from the life of Archbishop Conrad of Salzburg, ap. PEZ., *Thesaur. Anecd.*, vol. ii. p. 3, No. 227, quoted by Stentzel, shows the extent of the imperial usurpation by means of these symbols: "Forma vero electionis quæ tunc fiebat episcoporum et regalium abbatum talis erat: defuncto Ecclesiæ cujuslibet episcopo vel abbate, mox ad palatium proficisci non differunt, præpositus, decanus, magister scolarum et prior monasterii, et cum eis majores et seniores concilii personæ de civitate, *annulum episcopalem* secum portantes et baculum, communicatoque concilio cum his quos in palatio circa imperatorem (esse opportebat) episcopis, cancellario et capellano, secundum beneplacitum et favorem imperatoris, cui sustinendus erat, eligebatur."—Now as Archbishop Adalbert perfectly defined it during the negotiations which ended in the concordat, "*Solius enim consecratoris est dare annulum et baculum.*"—Ap. MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Collect.*, i. 680.

King of England, who retained his right to the prelates' homage. In the same manner, fifty years earlier, at the commencement of the contest, and in the first fervour of its zeal, this was all that the victorious Catholic party demanded; for Rodolph of Suabia, when, after the deposition of the Emperor Henry, he was elected king at Forchheim by the legates and allied princes, had formally recognised and practised this very distinction with regard to a bishop who had been freely elected, and he did this in obedience to decrees given by Gregory VII. in the council of Rome.[1] Moreover, the right of investing with ecclesiastical property, by means of a special symbol, bishops already consecrated and invested by the crosier and ring, had been formally acknowledged by Abbot Geoffrey of Vendôme, one of the most zealous champions of the Church during all the contest,[2] who maintained that investiture in general was a heresy. According to the treaty of Worms, the symbol adopted was a sceptre, symbol of the temporal authority of a king, and of the protection which he owed to the Church, which was given to him at the altar with his crown when he was consecrated. The triumph then was immense—as is proved by the unanimous impression of contemporaries[3]—and its

[1] At the election of Wigold, Bishop of Augsburg in 1078; "Cui rex post peracta legitime omnia quæ ad ordinationem ipsius pertinebant videlicet annulo, virga pastorali, et cathedra episcopali ab archiepiscopo Moguntino susceptis, ex sua parte *quicquid regii juris* fuerit *in procurandis bonis Ecclesiasticis* diligenter commandavit. Carebat namque ut obedientissimus erat in omnibus quod Romana synodo nuper canonice definitum est," &c.—BERNOLD. CONSTANT. in USSERMANN, *Germ. sacr. prodr.*, ii. 82.

[2] "Possunt itaque *sine offensione* reges, post electionem canonicam et consecrationem, per investituram regalem, in Ecclesiasticis possessionibus concessionem, auxilium et defensionem episcopo dare, quod, *quolibet signo*, factum extiterit, regi vel pontifici seu catholicæ fidei non nocebit."—GODFR. VINDOC. ab. *Opusc.* iv., ap. SIRMOND, Ep. iii. c. 890. Cf. FLEURY, *Hist. ecclés.*, b. 67, No. 26.

[3] "Quemadmodum in Lateranensi palatio tabula privilegio repræsentat, pax ad *velle papæ*, ab imperatore simul et recepta est et perpetuo annuente Domino stabilita."—PAND. PISAN., *Vit. Calixt.* "Igitur Romano

moral effects continued through all the rest of the middle ages.

It would have been quite otherwise if the Church, overcome in the struggle, had been obliged to receive laws from the victor. We should then have seen realised the state of things which Geoffrey of Vendôme thus pictures in his letter addressed to Pope Calixtus II. after his glorious victory: "When the Church is subjected to the temporal power, from being a queen she becomes a slave; she loses that charter of liberty which the Lord Christ gave to her from His cross, and signed with His blood." [1]

But this divine charter, which shall never perish, was saved by the papacy; such as St. Gregory had handed it on to successors filled with his own spirit.[2] Men who possessed both mental power and moral character of the highest order—men such as Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard of

imperio multis modis in se attrito, imperator propter anathema deficere a se regnum videns, patresque metuens exemplum . . . investituram . . . resignavit. . . . Exhinc Ecclesia *libertate ad plenum restituta*, paceque ad integrum reformata, in magnum montem crevisse sub Calixto papa II., invenitur."—OTTO FRISING., *Chron.*, vii. 24. "Reddit Apostolico Cæsar quæcumque rogavit, pax bona conficitur, sublato Deo reparavit: jura suæ partis lætus uterque trahit."—GODEFRID. VITERBIENSIS., *Chron.*, part xvii. p. 509. See also the passages quoted above from the *Chron. Urspery.* No contemporary author can be quoted who expresses the opposite opinion. Pfeffel, who calls himself *jurisconsult to the king*, more frank than the historians of the modern German school, speaks without reserve of "that *shameful* treaty which overthrew to the very foundations such remnants of authority as the emperors had preserved."—Vol. i. p. 207 of the edition of 1766. See also the descriptions in BOWDEN'S *Life of Gregory VII.*, ii. 372; and STENTZEL'S acknowledgments, i. 709, 739; and those of GERVAIS, i. 336.

[1] "Quando vere Ecclesia seculari potestati subjicitur quæ ante domina erat, ancilla efficitur, et quam Christus Dominus dictavit in cruce, et quasi propriis manibus de sanguine suo scripsit chartam libertatis amittit."—GODFR. VINDOC., Ep. in not. ad Yvon. Ep. p. 205.

[2] Gregory VII., Urban II., Calixtus II., and Alexander III. were not chiefs of one Italian party against another, still less chiefs of the nation against foreigners. They were what they were bound to be—the leaders of Christendom—nothing more, and nothing less.—CÆSAR, COUNT BALBO, *Della Speranza d'Italia.*

Toledo, Yves of Chartres, Geoffrey of Vendôme, William of Hirschau, Adalbert of Mayence, Frederic of Cologne, Conon of Palestrina, and William of Champeaux—arose on all sides to strengthen the Church by their devoted services. Supported by the swords of her Norman and Saxon auxiliaries, by an episcopate which her influence had regenerated, and yet more by the fervent and numberless legions of monks, the papacy gave battle to the Genius of Evil, and, after half a century of dangers, trials, and unheard-of miseries, put him to flight. No man, therefore, who has the smallest knowledge of history, can fail to see in Rome the sanctuary of spiritual freedom, the bulwark of human dignity, and the hearth where burned the inextinguishable flame of truth. Christendom, encouraged and saved, must have joined with transport in the enthusiastic sentiments which Hildebert of Le Mans,[1] a great French bishop, puts into the mouth of converted Rome, herself celebrating her triumph over pagan Rome: "When I adored false gods I was great by war, great by my people, and great by my fortifications. But the day came when, overthrowing my idols and their altars, I decided to serve the one only God. Then my citadels were taken, my palaces destroyed; then my soldiers fled, and my people became slaves. I have hardly preserved even the memory of what I was; scarcely does Rome remember Rome and her ruin. But this ruin is dearer to me than all glories. Poor, I feel myself of more value than when I was rich; struck to the earth, I am greater than when I stood

[1] Bishop of Le Mans in 1098, he went to Rome in 1107 and 1116, and was elected Archbishop of Tours in 1123, the year of the Lateran Council. His poems were much sought after and carried to Rome by the cardinal-legates, as we are told by Ordericus Vitalis, his contemporary, who calls him "*incomparabilis versificator*," and adds, "Multa carmina priscis pœmatibus æqualia, vel eminentiora condidit."—B. x. p. 770. We will give the text of this poem upon Rome. I do not think that the Christian greatness of Rome has ever been celebrated in any language in equally fine verses, and they are as little known as they are beautiful. [Probably M. de Montalembert intended to place this poem in the appendix if he had lived to complete his work. It is not, however, given there.—*Translator.*]

upright. I owe my conquests more to the banner of the Cross than to my once invincible eagles; more to Peter than to Cæsar; more to an unarmed troop than to all my ancient heroes. Once, when I was powerful, I conquered the world; now in my feebleness I conquer hell. While I stood, I reigned over bodies; beaten down, I reign over souls. . . . God, lest I should believe that I owed my empire to the Cæsars or to the might of their arms, has caused the power of my long victorious legions to perish. The glory of my senate has passed away; my temples and theatres lie in ruins, my tribune is silent, my edicts are forgotten, my people are without laws, and my fields without husbandmen; my proud plebeians bend under the yoke. All these things have befallen me lest the Roman should be tempted to place his hope in that which has ceased to exist, and should forget the Cross. The Cross provides for him other palaces and other honours; it opens infinite kingdoms to its soldiers. Kings are the servants of the Cross, but they remain free under its government; they have the fear of God, but they have also the love of Him. To whom is this new empire owing? To the sword of what Cæsar? to the genius of what consul? to the eloquence of what orator? It was to them that I once owed the conquest of the earth; but by the Cross alone I have made the conquest of heaven!"

This brilliant triumph and its immense results would not have been possible if the Church had not had command of the energy, discipline, and inexhaustible resources of the Monastic Orders. Each page of the preceding narrative must have shown the value of that aid which monks constantly rendered to the good cause. Never was such aid more frequent or more important than during the crisis that decided for several centuries the destinies of the Church and the Catholic nations. From the time of Gregory VII. to that of Calixtus II. all the popes, as we have seen, were taken from the Monastic Orders; and in the great councils which settled the litigated questions, the number of abbatial

crosiers surpassed even the number of episcopal ones. There were, indeed, more than two hundred at the Council of Rheims, when imperial power suffered its last check before it surrendered; and more than six hundred at the Œcumenical Council of the Lateran, where peace and the victory of the Church were finally established.

But it is not only in great assemblies, or in the midst of the public affairs of their time, that monks deserve our attention and admiration; it is also, and chiefly, in their private life, in the interior of their monasteries, where, by fidelity to the holy traditions of earlier generations, by the maintenance of principles which had governed six centuries of their history, they won the right to be placed in the first rank of the Church's champions. If a gradual relaxation, and some disorders inseparable from human weakness, did occasionally, in times of trial, tarnish the glory of certain famous abbeys, there were never wanting, as we may easily convince ourselves, vigorous and holy minds eager to return to primitive order and purity, to restore the old houses which had fallen into decay, or to found new ones worthy of their prototypes.

Wherever exact discipline and the fervent practice of ascetic virtues flourished, there flourished also the culture of letters, the progress of science, and the love of learning. In these ages of pretended ignorance, there was not a town, not a village, which had not its public school.[1] The most generous emulation reigned; the monastic schools competed with the great episcopal schools, whither, as at Laon under the schoolmaster Anselm, at Liège under the schoolmaster Alger, at Rheims, at Orleans, at Poitiers, at Angers, at Chartres, and, above all, at Paris,[2] there pressed eagerly a

[1] GUIBERT. NOVIG., *Gest. Franc.*, b. i. pp. 367, 368, ed. D'Achery.

[2] *Hist. litt. de France*, vol. ix. p. 30 *et seq.*; LANDULPH. jun., ap. MURAT., *Script. d'Italia*, vol. v. p. 478. See the picture sketched by John of Salisbury of his studies at Paris in the *Metalogicus*, b. ii. and iii. It will astonish those who do not know what marvellous activity and productive freedom reigned in medieval intelligences.

crowd of masters and students from all countries, whom the double bond of faith and learning united into a single commonwealth. A brilliant education was given at Marmoutiers, which maintained the splendour and purity derived from its glorious founder, St. Martin of Tours; at Vezelay, where Peter the Venerable was professor before he became Abbot of Cluny; at St. Germain-des-Prés, at Moutier-la-Celle, at St. Benoit-sur-Loire, at Chaise-Dieu, at St. Nicaise, at St. Rémy of Rheims; and, finally, at St. Denis, where Louis le Gros, King of France, had studied, and won the reputation of a learned theologian.[1]

All these monasteries served as so many great centres of education and of literary life. It was the same with the abbeys of the Low Countries, and especially with Liessies, Lobbes, St. Bertin, St. Frond, Afflighem, and Gembloux.[2] At St. Laurent at Liège, the names of monks who were authors made up a catalogue too long to quote;[3] but the abbeys of Normandy seem to have excelled all others during this period by their steady union of exact discipline with the culture of letters. Among their inhabitants we find most worthy of admiration William, Abbot of Cormeilles;[4] Richard, Abbot of Préaux, whose learning and piety are praised by Yves of Chartres;[5] and Abbot William of Troarn,[6] the intimate friend of St. Anselm. Under the excellent Abbot William de Ros,[7] the Abbey of Fécamp excited the sympathy and admiration of travellers;[8] and

[1] Suger calls Louis le Gros *literatissimus theologus.*—*Vit. Ludov. Gross.*, p. 320, ed. Duchesne. Thibault of Champagne and Stephen of Blois, afterwards King of England, were educated by Abbot Gotfried of Croyland.

[2] Under Abbot Anselm, elected in 1113, who was full of zeal for the improvement of his library.—*Hist. litt. de France*, vol. xi. In the impossibility of quoting at every word, we refer for the facts of this chapter, which are not supported by any text given, to the *Annales Benedictines* of MABILLON, b. 70, 75, and to the *Hist. litt. de France*, vols. ix., x., and xi., especially the preliminary discourse to vol. ix. by D. Rivet.

[3] *Hist. Litt.*, ix., 99.

[4] Died in 1109.

[5] 1101 to 1131.—YVON. Ep. 143.

[6] Died in 1110.

[7] Died in 1107.—ORDER. VIT., *passim*; MABILL., *Ann.*, b. 65, No. 67.

[8] Balderic, Archbishop of Dol, makes a great eulogy of this abbot.—Ap.

the Abbey of Bec, equally flourishing and regular, remained worthy of the noble reputation won for it by Lanfranc and Anselm, and constantly furnished bishops and abbots both to England and Normandy.[1] Knowledge was cultivated there with such ardour that a contemporary who lived in the neighbourhood has not hesitated to say that every monk of this privileged community might pass for a philosopher, and that the least instructed among them were capable of teaching the most self-satisfied grammarians.[2]

If the rule of the new monks of La Chartreuse forbade them to have schools, they made up for this by the ardour they showed in copying and dispersing manuscripts. The library which they formed was considered one of the richest among the great number belonging to monasteries.[3]

Even the abbeys of nuns kept up not only schools but libraries, and the veil was given to none who did not understand Latin.[4]

MABILL., *Ann.*, b. 71, No. 33, and *Neustria Pia*, c. 33. There was one monk especially famed for his learning, Adhelm, first a monk at Flaix or St. Germer in Picardy : "Litteris liberalibus apprime eruditus."—ORDER. VIT., b. viii. p. 709.

[1] The most famous abbot whom she sent to England, after St. Anselm, was Gislebert Crespin, grandson of the Count of Brionne, and Abbot of Westminster.

[2] "Sic ex bono usu in tantum Beccenses cœnobitæ studiis literarum sunt dediti, et in quæstione seu probatione sacrorum ænigmatum utiliumve sermonum insistunt seduli, ut pene omnes videantur philosophi, et ex collocutione eorum etiam qui videntur inter eos illiterati et vocantur rustici, possint ediscere sibi commoda spumantes grammatici."—ORD. VIT., b. iv. p. 246.

[3] The *Histoire littéraire* mentions specially at this epoch the libraries of St. Père at Chartres, Fleury, Corbie, Vendôme, St. Victor at Marseilles, St. Pierre-le-Vif at Sens, and St. Rémy at Rheims. The long enumeration may be found in vol. ix. p. 140 *et seq.* of this history.

[4] *Hist. litt. de France*, vol. ix. p. 127, 129. The nuns of Admont are praised as "*valde literatæ et scientia S. Scripturæ mirabiliter exercitatæ*" (*Hist. nigr. Silv.*, ii. 91, ap. HURTER, iii. 580). This title of *literatæ* was usually employed to distinguish the nuns of the choir from the *conversæ*, who were chiefly occupied with the manual work of the house. But even among these there were some who knew how to write and copy manuscripts.—See HURTER, *loc. cit.*, not. 412, and p. 526.

The regular canons, who during this period were more and more nearly assimilated to the sons of St. Benedict, yielded in nothing to the monks of that order. No school, indeed, was more famous or more frequented than that which grew up around the illustrious William of Champeaux, when, after having long been professor of dialectics and rhetoric at the cathedral school at Paris, he left the world and founded the Abbey of St. Victor,[1] whence he was afterwards called to be placed in the episcopal see of Châlons, and to be employed as plenipotentiary of the Church in the contest with Henry V. Every one has heard how, attracted by the fame of William's teaching, such a multitude of students flocked to his lectures on dialectics and rhetoric at Paris that it was impossible to lodge them in the cloister, where, however, the most exemplary fervour existed. Neither the diversity of language and race, nor the necessity of long and dangerous journeys—neither general and private wars, nor the interest of so many contemporary events—could diminish the activity and intensity of study in these various schools. A striking proof of this may be seen in the curious narrative left us of his journey in 1118 by Rupert, a monk of St. Laurent at Liège, and afterwards Abbot of Deutz, near Cologne. He was one of the most prolific but most controverted writers of his time. Having heard, one day, that his doctrine of the origin of evil had been attacked by Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, the two great luminaries of the French schools, Rupert immediately resolved to go to France, and, mounted on a poor little ass, with one companion,[2] he travelled as

[1] This famous abbey, the last traces of which were destroyed in 1842, by the order of the municipal administration of Paris, and in spite of many and earnest protests, was, in 1108, when William of Champeaux retired thither, only a *cell* dependent on St. Victor of Marseilles. It became an abbey only in 1113 when William was elected Bishop of Châlons. Afterwards it became the head of a congregation, and several monasteries of regular canons were under its rule.—MABILL., b. 69, No. 70; FLEURY, b. 66, No. 25.

[2] "Mirum mihimet nunc est illud recordationis meæ spectaculum,

far as Paris in order to confute his formidable opponents, even in their own professorial chairs. The contest ended, the good monk hastened, as he himself expresses it, "to return to his monastic solitude by the door of obedience." [1]

In England, four Norman monks, transplanted from St. Evroul to Croyland, with the eloquent and learned Abbot Joffridus,[2] previously professor at Orleans, bethought themselves of opening a public course of instruction in a barn which they hired at the gates of the town of Cambridge; but as very soon neither this barn nor other larger buildings could contain the crowd of both men and women who flocked to listen to them, the monks of Croyland decided to organise the teaching given by the professors on the model of the community's monastic exercises. Thus, Brother Odo was appointed to lecture upon grammar at daybreak, following the system of Priscian and Remigius; brother Terric, at prime, on the logic of Aristotle, with the commentaries of Porphyry and Averroes; brother William, at tierce, on the rhetoric of Cicero and Quintilian; while the most learned monk of the community, brother Gislebert, explained the Holy Scriptures to priests and the learned [3] on every feast-day, and also preached to the people every Sunday, notwithstanding his want of familiarity with the language. Such was the commencement of the University

quomodo solus ego vili asello residens, juvenculus, uno tantum puero comitatus, ad exteras tam long civitates, ad conflictum contra tales profectus sum."—RUPERTI TUITIENSIS, *Comment. in Reg. S. Bened.* b. i.

[1] "Per januam obedientiæ eductus."—*Ibid.* He found that Anselm of Laon was dead, but went on to Châlons, where he had *acerbum confictum* with the bishop. The superiors of this ardent controversialist sent him to St. Laurent at Siegburg, where we find him later.

[2] "Sermonem suo more ad populum habebat, concurrentibus ad eum ex vicinis etiam locis viris et mulieribus, qui, licet Latine vel Gallice loquentem minime intelligerent, tamen in illum intendentes, virtute verbi Dei et vultu ejus gratia ad lacrymas ita compuncti erant ut," &c. —MABILLON, *Ann. Ben.*, b. 71, No. 88.

[3] "Sacras paginas exponebat literatis ac sacerdotibus ad ipsius auditorium specialius confluentibus . . . rudis in Anglicana lingua, sed expeditus et dissertus in Latina et sua Gallicana. . . ."—MABILL., *loc. cit.*

of Cambridge, a slender stream which was soon, according to the expression of a French monk, to become a great river fertilising all England.[1]

Evidently, then, it was not theology alone which monks learned and taught. In their studies they embraced the whole of what were then called the seven liberal arts[2]—grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, on one hand; music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy, on the other.[3] They added to these the study of law and medicine; and we find, trained in the cloister, learned jurisconsults and famous physicians,[4] whose skill was acknowledged by all, and who used this skill freely until the day when the exercise of their two professions was forbidden to monks by the Council of Rheims, in 1131.[5]

Several of the local codes, known by the name of Customs, had monks for their authors; thus the customs of St. Sever were drawn up by Suave, abbot of that place;[6] those of Lavedan by Pierre, Abbot of St. Savin;[7] those of Bigorre by Gregoire d'Asten, Abbot of St. Né;[8] and, later, those of Poperinghe, in Flanders, by Leo, Abbot of St. Bertin.[9] In various countries, these interpreters of the local customs appeared as the living personification of law and justice; and it was in this character that Thieuffroy, Abbot of Echternach, was summoned from the banks of the Moselle to appease the troubles of Zealand, where the inhabitants imagined that in the pious jurisconsult they saw revived

[1] "Ex isto itaque fonte parvo, qui crevit in fluvium jam magnum, videmus nunc lætificatam civitatem Dei, et totam Angliam factam frugiferam per plurimos magistros et doctores de Cantabrigia exeuntes ad similitudinem sanctissimi paradisi."—PETR. BLESENSIS, ap. *Ann.*, *loc. cit.*

[2] The three first formed the *trivium* or course of primary instruction, and the four last the *quadrivium* or secondary course.

[3] *Hist. litt. de Fr.*, vol. ix. p. 218.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[5] ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. litt.*, O. S. B., ii. 249.

[6] MARTÈNE, *Thes. anecdot.*, vol. i. p. 277.

[7] *Hist. litt.*, ix. 614.

[8] *Ibid.*, ix. 568.

[9] *Chronic. S. Bertini*, c. 24, ap. D. MARTÈNE, *Thes. anec.*, vol. iii.

their first apostle, St. Willebrod, the founder of Echternach.[1]

The monks of this epoch collected historical narratives with not less zeal and conscientiousness than had been shown by their predecessors. It is owing to their labours alone that we are acquainted with the events of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

The chronicles of St. Hubert, written by monks whose names are forgotten;[2] those composed at Auersperg by the monk John;[3] at Bèze, by Clarius;[4] at St. Pierre-le-Vif, by Léon le Marsique; and at Monte Cassino, by the Deacon Peter; by Abbot Robert, at St. Rémy at Rheims; and by Abbot Rodolph, at St. Frond,[5]—carry on, without interruption, the chain of Catholic annals. To this list we must add Hugh of St. Marie,[6] and Sigebert of Gembloux,[7] whose historical talent deserves to be pointed out, notwith-

[1] *Ann. Bened.*, b. 65, No. 46.

[2] It ends in 1106.

[3] This chronicle, which has been published by D. MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Collect.*, iv., is the most important authority for the history of the eleventh century. It is composed of two distinct parts: the first, which we have to do with, and which ends in 1126, is the work of a monk of Bamberg, as has been proved by Stentzel, in his excellent *critique* of the historians of this epoch (vol. ii. p. 106), founded upon a previous work of Schumacher, published in 1770.—Cf. with PAGI, *Crit.*, in BARON., 1102 and 1105.

[4] *Spicileg.*, vol. i.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Hugh of St. Marie was a monk of Fleury, and died in 1109. Besides the much-esteemed chronicle, which ceases with Charles the Bald, and which has been published by Duchesne and D. Bouquet, he has left a treatise, entitled *De regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate* (published by BALUZE, *Miscell.*, vol. iv.), in which are found most of the modern theories as to the submission due to kings, even pagan, the absolute obedience due to sovereignty, &c. Naturally Hugh shows himself favourable to the custom of investiture.

[7] Born in 1030, and dying in 1112, Sigebert of Gembloux left a reputation for learning and piety. The letter from the clergy of Liège to Pascal II., in favour of the schism and of the emperor, is attributed to him. In his chronicle, he says that the decrees of Gregory VII. against simony and the marriage of priests are contrary to the sentiments of the holy Fathers (see ad ann. 1074). Accordingly, the learned authors of the *Histoire littéraire* have described him as "a good citizen, devoted to his lawful prince."—*Hist. litt.*, vol. ix. p. 536.

standing the flagrant opposition of their opinions on all questions of social laws and Catholic policy to the theory and practice followed by all the most approved pontiffs and doctors of the middle ages. Above all, we must not forget Gilbert, Abbot of Nogent, who was not only the worthy successor of St. Godefroy on his abbatial throne,[1] but who also has left us a most animated account of the First Crusade, and, in his own memoirs, an invaluable picture of the domestic and religious life of his time.

But of all sciences, that which was best taught and practised in the monastery schools was the knowledge of salvation. It was for this reason that exemplary bishops could always be found there—as Richard of Narbonne was found at St. Victor of Marseilles,[2] the great and intrepid Conon of Palestrina at Arouaise, Ralph of Canterbury at St. Martin at Séez,[3] Serlon of Séez at St. Evroul.[4] This is the reason why so many of the most illustrious prelates, such as Marbodius, Bishop of Rennes,[5] and William of Champeaux,[6] were anxious to end their lives as monks. This explains the invincible attraction exercised by the life of the cloister over so many of the noblest spirits among that generous nobility, which was not contented with hurrying in crowds to the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre, or to fight for the Church on innumerable battle-fields, but

[1] Elected in 1104, died in 1123, Gilbert of Nogent is the author of the chronicle entitled *Gesta Dei per Francos*, and of three books, *De Vita sua*, edited by D'Achery, in 1651.

[2] In 1106. [3] In 1114.

[4] In 1091; he died in 1122. See the touching account given by Ordericus Vitalis (vol. xii. pp. 8, 887) of the death of this holy prelate while he was occupied about receiving legates of Calixtus II.

[5] "Monachum professus 13 Albino se tradidit ac sic exoneratus pauperum Christum pauper et de seculis est."—*Encycl. monach. S. Albin*, ap. *Ann. Bened.*, b. 74, No. 56. He was one of the most learned doctors of his time; he died at St. Albin, at Angers, in 1123, after an episcopate of twenty-eight years, having been elected by Urban II. His works in prose and verse have been published by D. Beaugenet, at the end of those of Hildebert—folio, 1708.

[6] At Clairvaux, in 1121.

who so abundantly peopled the monasteries, that it would be difficult to name one of the great feudal families which had not one or more of its members in the cloister.

During the whole time of the war of investitures, conversions were quite as frequent and exemplary as in the preceding ages. Names without number present themselves to the writer's pen. Cluny continued to be a nursery of saints. Godefroy, Count of Mortagne and Perche, after a life devoted to the duties of his station, chose to die in the monastic robe.[1] Harpin, Count of Bourges, on his return from the Crusade and a long captivity, became, by the advice of Pascal II., a monk at Cluny.[2] Coming home from the Holy Land, where he had long been a prisoner among the infidels, Geoffrey, lord of Semur,[3] brother of the great and holy Abbot Hugh, went, with one of his sons and three of his daughters, to seek retirement at Cluny. The latter were placed at Marcigny, of which their father became prior. After his death, Geoffrey appeared in a dream to a nun of the abbey, to bid her desire his successor to suppress the heavy tax which he repented having laid, during his lifetime, on the inhabitants. This tax fell upon the linen and woven stuffs which it was usual to wash in the moat of the castle of Semur, and which were brought from all parts to be bleached at that place.

William, Count of Mâcon, gladly declared to the friends of peace and truth[4] that he confirmed to Cluny the donations made to her daughter, Marcigny, by four generations of his ancestors, especially by his uncle and his mother,

[1] "Strenuus heros, omnibus rite peractis, Cluniacencis monachus factus est."—ORDER. VIT., b. xii. p. 890.

[2] *Ibid.*, b. x. p. 795. He had pledged his county to King Philip of France, to provide for the expense of the Crusade.

[3] The *Histoire littéraire* thinks this refers to Semur in Bronnais, and not to Semur in Auxois, but gives no authority for this opinion.

[4] "Vestibus ac telis quæ undecumque abluendæ ad castrum de Sinemuro deferuntur."—PETR. VENER., *De Mirac.*, b. i. c. 26; *Bibl. Cl.* p. 1289.

who was a nun there. St. Hugh's successor, Pons, whose administration was so excellent, and who took so important a part in the negotiations between the emperor and the Church, was son of the Count of Melgueil, nephew of the Count of Auvergne, godson of the pope, and cousin of the emperor.[1] Another knight, who, like the Count of Bourges, had returned from the First Crusade,[2] William Malet, lord of Graville, gave his estate of Conteville to Bec, and became a monk there.[3] About the same time, Count Robert de Meulan, Prime Minister of the King of England, whose father had died in the monastic habit, installed monks from Bec in his county of Meulan,[4] which the last male heir of that house had transmitted to him by a similar sacrifice.

In Aquitaine, a noble of Perigord, Gérard de Salis, having become a monk, and persuaded his father and brothers to follow his example, devoted his patrimony and his life to founding the five monasteries of Grandselm, Padouin, Le Bournet, D'Alen, and Les Chasteliers, where he died in 1120, leaving this five-fold inheritance to the Cistercians and St. Bernard.[5]

In Germany, Count Louis of Thuringia, surnamed the Leaper, ancestor of the husband of St. Elizabeth, died, after a long penance, in the abbey of Reinhartsbrünn, which he had founded in expiation of his crimes.[6] The young Bernard of Domnesleve, sole heir of a long line of heroes, and possessor of vast territories, became a monk after having bequeathed all his property to St. Maurice and St. Nicholas. Another young noble of Suabia, Adalberon, equally noble, rich, and accomplished, wearied of the life of

[1] "Cunctis animantibus pacem et veritatem."—Ann. 1107, *Ann. Bened.* b. 71, No. 44.

[2] See the portrait of him given by ORDER. VIT., b. xii. p. 887. As to Malet, see DUMOULIN, *Hist. de Normandie.*

[3] *Chron. Beccens.*, *Hist. litt. de France*, 2, xiv. p. 268.

[4] In 1101.

[5] *Ann. Bened.*, FLEURY, b. 66, c. 45.

[6] In 1123, according to MABILLON, *Ann. Bened.*, b. 66, c. 85; *Hist. de St. Eliz.*, ap. No. 6 of the octavo edition.

courts and retired to St. Hubert.[1] There, kneeling before the assembled chapter of the monks, amidst the tears called forth from those present by so great a proof of disinterestedness, he stripped himself of his rich clothing, throwing to the ground the gold ring from his finger, and putting on the Benedictine robe. But Bishop Barthélemy of Laon soon distinguished the young neophyte, whom he made an abbot, destined to become, later, the restorer of the ancient abbey of St. Vincent of Laon.[2]

In Switzerland, in a wild and frozen gorge of the Unterwald, the noble Conrad of Sellenburen founded a great abbey, which was subject only to the Holy See; Pope Calixtus approved of the foundation, and gave it the name of Mount of the Angels,[3] which it still retains. Conrad then renounced the trade of arms, stripped himself of all his fortune to live in monastic obedience, and shortly afterwards perished by the hands of brigands, while, like a poor shepherd, he was keeping the flocks of the monastery on land where he had formerly been lord and master.[4]

In another place, Garnier de Montmorillon, one of the most famous knights of Poitou, gave to a poor man the richly embroidered gloves which he had received from a lady whom he passionately loved, and by this sacrifice made the first step towards a life of forty years passed as a monk at Chaise-Dieu in the practice of the most austere regularity.[5]

[1] He died in 1117. See his genealogy, ap. *Annal. Saxo.*, ann. 1117.

[2] "Nobilis prosapiæ Suevus et multiplicis scientiæ clericus Constantiensis . . . juvenis tantarum divitiarum . . . pretiosissimas vestes abjiciens, annulum aureum digitis abstractum ad terram projiciens."—*Hist. Andagin.*, ap. MARTÈNE, *Ampliss. Collect.*, vol. v. p. 955. He died in 1120.

[3] "Engelberg . . . quod nos *Mons Angelorum* appellari volumus."—*Litter. Calixte II.* of April 5, 1124, in *Ann. Bened.*, b. 73, No. 116.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] "Miles illustris . . . chirothecas preciosas ab amica sibi directas."—ORDER. VIT., b. viii. p. 714. His brother Hilbebert, who had also been a knight, and who was converted at the same time, became nuncio of St. Cyprian, Abbot of Déols, and afterwards Archbishop of Bourges. Orderi-

At St. Martin of Tournay, the reforming abbot, Odo, attracted to his monastery the most powerful nobles of Hainault. Among these penitents we remark the noble Walter, who employed himself humbly in carrying water to the kitchen, bolting the flour, and cleaning the stables;[1] Count Louis of Thurin; and Ralph d'Osmond, husband of Mainsende, the daughter of a knightly house.[2] The latter, distressed to find his salvation continually risked in the world by constant relapses, was urged by his wife's own brother, who was a monk of St. Amand, to request from his consort permission to seek the safe shelter of a monastery. On the day when he had received this advice, Osmond was weeping, sitting on his bed; Mainsende coming in, asked the cause of his grief, and having learned it, bade him dry his tears, for she also desired to provide for the safety of her soul. Both, therefore, offered to God their persons, their property, and even their three children, the youngest of whom, still in the cradle, was laid by his mother upon the altar. This very child, reared in the cloister, has left us the touching account of a sacrifice which has few equals in history. This relinquishment of conjugal life, made to God by mutual consent, does indeed reappear in different forms. Thus, in Anjou,[3] Walter de Nidoiseau, having founded a monastery, to which he gave his name, on the banks of the Oudon, himself took the monastic habit

cus speaks of him under the date 1099. His conversion took place about 1078.—Cf. MABILLON, *Ann. Bened.*, b. 64, No. 98.

[1] "Insignis miles . . . de potentioribus provinciæ optimatibus . . . vir nobilis non erubuit aquam ad coquinam deferre, scutellas ollasque abluere, farinam cribare, equorum stabula mundare, multosque suo exemplo convertit."—*Herm. de instaur.*, S. MART. TORNAC., in *Spicileg.*, ii. 906. We have already seen the similar devotion of Osmond, friend and brother-in-arms of this Walter.—B. ii. c. 2.

[2] "Militibus provinciæ progenitam."—*Ibid.* Daughter of Hermann, provost of St. Amand.

[3] The hagiographer adds that all the Tournésis was moved by this example; and that very soon more than sixty converted women were collected in the house of his mother Mainsende, who, having given all to God, earned her living by spinning and weaving.

with his wife, and after having both spent holy lives there, they died the same day.[1]

Widows of high rank were accustomed to end their lives in monasteries. In this way the two illustrious sisters-in-law, Ida d'Avesnes, lady of Orsy, and Agnes de Ribemont, Countess d'Avesnes, gave themselves, one to St. Martin of Tournai, and the other to Liessies, which Ida's brother had restored, and where Agnes's husband was buried.[2] Repentance and innocence sought the same asylum; the beautiful Bertrade, the unfaithful widow of Fulk of Anjou, and of Philip, King of France, having been converted by a sermon of Robert d'Arbrissel, seized with horror for the lawlessness of her life, entered the order of Fontevrault in the flower of her age and her beauty, and there led so austere a life that she soon sank under her macerations.[3]

Elizabeth, believed to have been daughter of the Count of Crépy, and sister of St. Simon de Valois, left the abbey of Chelles to seek a more severe retreat, and, having found a desolate and marshy spot called Rosoy, near Courtenay, she lived there a long time in a hollow tree, exposed at first to the ridicule of the peasants, and afterwards so venerated and followed, that she was able to found, upon the site of the old tree, a great monastery, which was endowed by the lords of Courtenay.[4] Juliana, the natural daughter of Henry I. of England, one of the most wicked women of the age, and Matilda of Anjou, who had been married at twelve years old to the only son of the same king, and become a widow six months afterwards by the prince's

[1] "Dedi quamdam terram desertam supra Uldonium cum aqua et utilitate sua, quæ erat mei juris et potestatis," &c.—In 1109. MAB., *Ann. Bened.* b. 71, No. 83.

[2] Towards 1110.—*Ibid.*, b. 69, No. 12.

[3] "Ille ætate et sanitate integra, nec specie vulgata . . . sanctimonialium appetiit velum. . . . Victu cultuque in primis aspero atque horrido utens, vita statim privata est."—WILL. MALMESB., *De Gest. reg. Angl.*, b. v. She died at Haute-Bruyère, a house which she had given to the order of Fontevrault.

[4] *Ibid.*, b. 70, No. 80. She left Chelles about 1104, and died about 1130.

shipwreck, both became nuns at Fontevrault, the one to weep for her sins, the other "to live with the immortal Bridegroom."[1] Ermengarde, Duchess of Bretagne, set free by her husband's monastic vocation, was already there awaiting her noble companions. Many other widows of great personages took refuge at Fontevrault under Robert d'Arbrissel: Philippine, wife of William VII., Duke of Aquitaine; Hersende de Champagne, widow of the lord of Montsoreau; and Petronille de Craon, widow of the lord of Chemillé.[2] Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror, and mother of King Stephen of England, the friend of St. Anselm, went to increase the number of high-born nuns who peopled Marcigny, the illustrious offshoot of Cluny.[3] The Conqueror's daughter had already given one of her sons to the great abbey, so, she said, that she might not be reproached with having given birth to children only for the world;[4] and this son, afterwards an abbot and bishop, was always an exemplary monk.

The ruling races felt themselves obliged to furnish their contingent to the cloister as well as the ordinary nobility and the lower classes. Alain Fergent, Duke of Brittany, the husband of Ermengarde, who had led the flower of knighthood to the Crusade, and had made himself famous by his care for the administration of justice in his duchy,[5]

[1] ORDER. VIT., b. xii. pp. 864, 875.

[2] Ermengarde was daughter of Fulk of Anjou by his first wife, consequently aunt of Matilda, who was daughter of Fulk V., son of Fulk IV. and Bertrade. The B. Robert of Arbrissel died in the arms of Agnes, prioress of Orsan in Berry. "Nobilis monacha, quæ illi valde oppido cara habebatur, eo quod ipsa consilio ejus, fallaces seculi divitias, quæ sibi multum blandiebantur reliquerat, et pro Christo delegerat."—BALDRICUS, *Vita B. Roberti*, ap. *Acta SS.* BOLLANDI, vol. ii., Feb., p. 512. She had left her husband Alard, who was still alive when Robert died.—*Ibid.*, 615.

[3] ORDER. VIT., b. xii. p. 811.

[4] "Ne soli sæculo liberos genuisse videretur."—GUILL. NEUBRIGENSIS, b. i. c. 4. Henry was, in 1124, Abbot of Glastonbury, then of Reading, then Bishop of Winchester, and always remained a close friend of Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny.

[5] He established the Seneschal's Court at Rennes and restored the

had long been hostile to the abbey of Redon, and thus called down the anathemas of Abbot Hervé; yet, in 1112, touched by repentance, he entered that very abbey of Redon as a monk, and there spent seven years in the deepest humility.[1]

Alain's son-in-law, Baldwin VII., Count of Flanders, and nephew of Pope Calixtus II., in all the pride of youth and power, quarrelled with Henry, King of England and Duke of Normandy. Henry sent him word to look well to himself, or he would come as far as Bruges to find him. To which the count replied that the king might save himself that trouble,[2] as he would go to Rouen. And, in fact, he immediately started, with 500 horsemen, and struck his lance into the closed gate of Rouen, to provoke a combat with the king, who was remaining quietly in the city. This being still refused, the count returned, ravaging the country as he went, in order to show his contempt for the king. But he had scarcely arrived in his own States, when he received, in a tournament, a wound from which he soon felt that he should not recover. He therefore took the monk's robe at St. Bertin, where he shortly after died penitent, giving to the monks a deed in which he spoke as follows: "I feel that God has justly disciplined me, and chastised me on account of my sins, and especially because I have not given to the churches of the saints that honour and protection which I owed them since God had appointed me their defender; therefore, acting by the advice of the pious men whom the divine goodness has brought to visit me, I have taken refuge in this asylum of penitence and contrition, and I desire that in the future all the churches of God on my estates may enjoy liberty and peace, that they may pray fervently for me."[3] Ten months afterwards the count died,

ancient Parliament of Bretagne.—D'ARGENTRÉ, ap. COURSON, *Histoire des peuples bretons*, vol. ii. pp. 169–171.

[1] From 1112 to 1119.

[2] "Ne tantum laboris assumeret."—*Ann. Bened.*, b. 73, No. 82.

[3] "Deliberans in animo meo propter peccata mea a Deo juste flagellari et paterne castigari, maxime quia ecclesiis sanctorum quarum defensor a

and his uncle, Pope Calixtus II., then at the Council of Rheims, asked the prayers of the assembly for the soul of the noble penitent.[1]

Eight years later, the example of Baldwin drew into the same path his brother-in-law, William Cliton, heir-apparent of Normandy and claimant of the county of Flanders, who, being mortally wounded under the walls of Alost, desired also to die in the monk's habit at St. Bertin.[2] These knights, men of strong passions, hoped to expiate their faults and to purify their souls in the monastic robe. Their confidence was shared by their contemporaries, who all believed with the Church in the efficacy of prayer and the omnipotence of repentance. For these numberless vocations in all ranks of Christendom, it was needful to provide new asylums, and to enlarge while reforming those old foundations where, by a law equally wonderful and invariable in the history of the monastic orders, the throng of neophytes was always the greater the more strictly primitive fervour had been maintained. This fact can be easily proved during all the period which we have just reviewed.

In the course of our narrative we have remarked the happy influence of the reforming spirit of Cluny on the great abbeys of the Netherlands,[3] and admired the fruitfulness of the new foundations, due in France to Robert d'Arbrissel, founder and superior of Fontevrault, Bernard of Tiron, Vital of Savigny, and Gerard of Salis; and at the same time we have been obliged to defer for the present the history of the origin and growth of the Cistercian order.[4]

Domino sum constitutus . . . ut per hoc pro me affectuosius orare debeant," &c.—*Ann. Bened., loc. cit.*

[1] ORDER. VIT., b. xii. p. 863.—"Epistola Clementiæ sororis Papæ pro Balduino, Flandrensium comite filio suo, recitata est. Pro quibus et pro cunctis fidelibus defunctis lugubris pastor cum venerabili cœtu Deum deprecatus est."

[2] In 1127. ORDER. VIT., xii. pp. 885, 886. On his tomb was engraved: "Miles famosus Guillelmus ver generosus marchio Flandrensis jacet hic monachus Sitiensis."

[3] See above.

[4] Among the purely Benedictine foundations which became more rare

In Germany, the war between the Church and the empire did nothing to retard the permanent impulse which led the German nobles constantly to sanctify their domains by new religious foundations, and to enrich their possessions perpetually with new monasteries. Agnes, daughter of the schismatic emperor, Henry IV., who was first married to the Duke of Suabia and afterwards to the Margrave of Austria, founded, in concert with her first husband, Lorch in Suabia,[1] and with her second, the great abbey of Kloster-Neuberg, which has at present escaped secularisation, and still forms one of the noblest monuments on the banks of the Danube.

Agnes's second husband, the Margrave Leopold of Austria, by whom she had eighteen children, was afterwards canonised. As one day the husband and wife, discussing together their plan of building a monastery in honour of Mary and for the good of souls, asked God to enlighten them in the choice of a site, a light wind lifted the princess's veil and carried it away. On another day, nine years later, the Margrave, while hunting, found his wife's veil hanging upon a tree; and neither he nor she doubted that in this incident they were to see an indication of the divine will. Together they founded on this very spot the great abbey of Kloster-Neuberg, which, situated at the gates of Vienna, has hitherto escaped confiscation, and holds twenty parishes under its rule.[2]

in France in proportion as the new orders sprung from the primitive rule were developed, we must point out Maurigny, near Etampes, endowed in 1106 by Anseau the younger, Arembert, and Haimon de la Ferté-Baudouin, and soon loaded with donations by Philip I. and Louis VI.; among its benefactors it counted Ermanric, a *bourgeois* of Etampes. The Chronicle of Maurigny is one of the most important authorities for the history of this period; it is to be found in the *Scriptores* of DUCHESNE, vol. iv.

[1] Towards 1106, in the diocese of Augsburg. This must not be confounded with the much more ancient abbey of Lorsch in the diocese of Worms.

[2] Of the order of regular canons in 1114. "Concordes animi et uno spiritu arbitrati rem gratam Altissimo fore. . . . B. Mariæ templum, condere . . . ob honorem Dei et animarum salutem . . . et cum de loco ædis construendæ cogitarent, divina quasi voluntate ventus coercitus flammeolum Agnetis capite leviter sublatum. . . . Elapsis novem annis, marchio

Before Sigefroy, Count-Palatine, fell under the attacks of Henry V., he, in concert with the Countess Hedwige von Altenahr, had installed a colony from Afflighem at Laach,[1] where the church, with six towers, standing beside a solitary and picturesque lake, still forms one of the finest monuments of Roman architecture in the Rhine district.

The Counts of Andechis and Spanheim both founded, at their castle gates, monasteries which have perpetuated their names even to our days.[2] Count Wiprecht of Svoitsels, one of the emperor's most formidable adversaries, founded Pagau and Reinersdorf in Saxony, by the assistance and advice of Otho, Bishop of Bamberg.[3] This holy prelate, one of the most venerated of the time, for whose support the two opposite parties disputed, bore the most devoted and active affection to the monastic orders. He himself wished to become a monk in the abbey of St. Michel in his episcopal city; but after he had taken the vow of obedience there, he was forced, by the abbot, by virtue of that very promise, to return to his episcopal functions. He indemnified himself by founding or restoring fifteen abbeys[4] and six priories in his own diocese and in the neighbouring country. And to those who reproached him for having devoted all his revenues to this purpose, and kept nothing for the service of the

venationis actum exercens, flammeolum . . . super frutice sambuci invenit integrum."—*Oratio de S. Leopoldi et Summar Canonizat. S. Leopold.*, ap. PAZ *Script. rer. Austriac.*, vol. i. pp. 579, 616.

[1] This admirable church, commenced in 1093 by Henry, Count of Laach, was finished in 1112. When I visited it in 1833 it was used as farm-buildings by a Prussian functionary named Delius. An exact lithograph of it may be seen in the work of M. Sulpice Boisserée, entitled *Monuments du Bas-Rhin.* For the details of the foundation, see BROUWER, *Ann. Trevir.*, b. xiii. p. 7, and MAB., *Chron. Bened.*, b. 72, p. 47.

[2] Andulu, not far from Munich, 1120; and Spanheim, near Kreuznach, in 1124.

[3] MABILL., *Ann. Bened.*, b. 71, No. 90; VIT. WIPRACHT, c. vi.–x., ap. GERVAIS, b. 88.

[4] "Michelsberg, Pharis, Bantz, Aarau, Michelwend, Entzders, Prüfening, Gengenbach, Sentauer, Stein, Regentsters, Arnolstein, Clunick, Biburg, Hosterhof."—MABILL., *Ann., loc. cit.*

emperor, he answered, "These are inns of which we have but too much need in this earthly exile, while we are travelling far from God. The world is an exile, and our life a journey, where those who are still distant from God cannot meet with too many inns."

Otho had confided Prüfening,[1] the chief of his foundations, to a monk of Hirschau, Ermenold,[2] who was equally charitable and zealous. In a great scarcity, this holy man, having emptied the cellars and storehouses of his monastery to feed the poor of the neighbourhood, had himself, with his brethren, to suffer cruelly from famine, until one day a nobleman, who lived near, came to succour them. But if the gates of Prüfening remained always open to Christ's poor, the abbot knew how to close them against imperial majesty. When Henry V. came to visit the abbey, Ermenold would not communicate with one who was excommunicated.[3] He refused, in spite of the prayers of Bishop Otho himself, and the threats of the imperial *cortège*, to receive the monarch. The emperor had the generosity to respect this noble courage, which might have procured the palm of martyrdom for the venerable monk.

In England, Henry I. founded several monasteries, among others that of Reading, which he attached to Cluny, and where he chose his burial-place. This abbey, situated where the principal highways of the kingdom met, and possessed

[1] Near Ratisbon. There is a work on this monastery, *Fontilegium sacrum sive fundatio insignis monast. S. Georgii martyris Ord. S. Bened. vulgo Prüfening dicti*, &c., R. P. F. MELCHIORE WEXER, *ejusdem monasterii seniore:* Ingalstadii, 1626.

[2] He had first been Abbot of Lorch, founded by the sister of Henry V.; but hearing that the latter boasted of having made him a fine present for which he hoped some return, he was horrified at the idea of simony, and returned to Hirschau with forty of his monks.—MABILL., b. 71, c. 24.

[3] "Venerabilis Otto se interponens: neminem, ait, devitare debemus et tenemur, de cujus nobis excommunicatione non constat. Quo contra vir Dei . . . ne gratiæ fundatoris nec imperatoriæ deferens majestati, veritatem libere testaretur: non possum, inquit, sententiam ignorare, quam ore meo memini promulgatam."—*Act. S.* ERMENOLD.

of a hospital and lazar-house, became, as it were, the greatest inn of the realm; and, thanks to its unwearied hospitality, could always count more guests than inhabitants.[1] Croyland, which had been in Saxon times the most honoured of the English monasteries, rose from her decay under the care of her learned abbot, Godfrey of Orleans, whom we have already seen presiding at the formation of the University of Cambridge. Godfrey had the happiness of completing this work by a means much used in those days;[2] monks carrying relics and indulgences travelled about in the name of the English bishops, offering them to all who would give their assistance.[3] These collectors went not only throughout England, but also Scotland, Ireland, Flanders, and France; they brought back large sums of money, and also, what was much better, a great number of foreign monks,[4] so sincere and deep was the brotherhood which united all Christian nations, and which was chiefly cemented by the monastic orders. The first stone of the new church was laid in 1114 with a solemnity, and in presence of a crowd, which testified to the general sympathy felt by men of the time in such undertakings: while 400 strange monks dined in the refectory, the counts, nobles, and knights of the neighbourhood were entertained in the abbot's parlour; in the cloisters, visitors of lower rank, with their wives, filled six long

[1] "Hospitalitatis indefessæ et dulcis indicium . . . ut plus hospites, totis horis venientes, quam inhabitantes insumant."—GUILL. MALM., 46, 2; *De pont. Angl., Monast. Anglic.*, vol. i. p. 419; *Ann. Bened.*, b. 73, No. 143.

[2] See the curious account of a similar journey made by the canons of Laon in France and England, written by the monk Hermann.—*D. Mirac. S. Mar. Laudun.*, b. i., printed by D'Achery at the end of the works of Gilbert of Nogent, pp. 536–542, and extracted by D. LELONG., *Hist. du dioc. de Laon;* and *Hist. litt. de France*, vol. xii.

[3] "Ab Episcopis Anglicanis indulgentiam tertiæ partis pœnitentiarum impetravit, pro iis omnibus, xc."—MABILL., *Ann. Bened.*, b. 71, No. 87.

[4] "Quod tam feliciter successit, ut non modo magnam pecuniæ summam quæstores illi attulerint, sed etiam multos ad monasticam vitam adduxerint."—MABILL., *loc. cit.*

tables; and in the open air more than 5000 labourers and artisans, and others of inferior condition, were served by the monks themselves. Two princes, who had studied at Orleans under Abbot Godfrey, Thibault, the great Count of Champagne, and his brother, Stephen of Blois, afterwards King of England, nephews to King Henry, put a seal to the solemnity by coming to embrace their former master, and bring him, from their uncle, the royal confirmation of the immunities granted to the abbey.[1]

While Ralph,[2] a Norman monk, occupied as St. Anselm's successor the primatial throne in England, the Scots desired to have an English monk as Archbishop of St. Andrews and primate of Scotland.[3] Eadmer, Anselm's friend and biographer, whom King Alexander of Scotland had obtained from the church of Canterbury to fill this office, had many difficulties to undergo. It happened that the king, after having eagerly desired the nomination of the venerable monk, did not find him ready enough to yield to his will. Like most kings in this world, Alexander wished to be everything in his own kingdom, and to tolerate no one there who was not entirely submissive to his authority.[4] But Eadmer was resolved not to break all connection with his monastery, but to have himself consecrated by his legitimate archbishop, and to remain subordinate to him; he declared also, that if all Scotland were to be given to him, he would never cease to be a monk of Canterbury. Finding that he could not overcome the king's resistance, Eadmer laid his archiepiscopal crosier down upon the altar whence he had taken it, without having received investiture or done homage, and returned to his abbey; thus bearing witness, as he

[1] PETRUS BLESENSIS, ap. MABILL., *Ann. Bened.*, b. 72, No. 71.

[2] Son of Siffroy, lord of Scurris. He had been Abbot of Séez and Bishop of Rochester before he was elected Archbishop of Canterbury in 1114.

[3] In 1120.

[4] "In regno suo vult esse omnia solus, nec sustinebit ut quævis potestas sine ejus dispositione quicquam in aliquo possit."—EADM., *Hist. novor.*, b. 5, p. 99, ed. Gerberon.

himself says, that he had been trained in the school of St. Anselm.[1]

King Alexander's brother and successor, David, Earl of Lothian, son of St. Margaret, and canonised like his mother, showed the most ardent devotion to monks. The virtues of the founder of Tiron being described to him, produced such an effect upon his mind that he left his own country to visit the holy old man in France. But Bernard having died in the interval, the young prince could only kneel on the tomb of him whose blessing he had come to seek. The journey of the Earl of Lothian was not, however, quite useless; he brought back twelve disciples of the revered master with him to Scotland, and afterwards established them at Kelso.[2]

The relations between crowned heads and monks were both frequent and much prized. Henry I. of England, in spite of his conflicts with St. Anselm and with Calixtus, had always at heart an affectionate respect for the inhabitants of the cloister. He chose the two abbots, Joffrid of Croyland and Gislebert of Westminster,[3] for his ambassadors when, in 1118, he wished to negotiate with Louis le Gros, King of France. In 1113 we find him going to St. Évroul to celebrate the feast of the Purification; he sat for a long time in the cloisters of the abbey, asking about the customs and manner of life of the monks, and showing unqualified approbation. The following day the prince entered the chapter and asked to be affiliated to the congregation, which was granted; and in return he gave to the monastery a deed of protection, signed by himself and all his lords.[4]

[1] EADM., *Hist. novor.*, b. 6. p. 102. Afterwards he showed himself more tractable, and wrote to the king to tell him that he would give up the supremacy of the primate of Canterbury. The result of this concession is not known.

[2] MABILL., *Ann. Bened.*, b. 73, c. 53. *Act. SS.* BOLLANDI, die April 14.

[3] They were both Frenchmen. M. Thierry has extracted the passage of Eadmer in which he points out Henry's systematic opposition to the election of abbots of English descent.

[4] "Cum magna hilaritate . . . in claustro monachorum diu sedit

In 1124, hearing that the old Abbot William, St. Anselm's successor at Bec, was dying, after an abbacy of thirty years, Henry went to see him, and begged him to name his successor. William replied that the canons forbade him to make this choice; but begged the king to permit the election of a monk of ripe age and irreproachable life. At these words, Henry took the abbot's hand, and having kissed it, placed it on his eyes, as if to be blessed by it;[1] and when William had breathed his last, and his body was laid in the church, the king went to look at it, saying, "God grant that my soul may one day be where his soul is!"[2]

This emotion was profitable both to the soul of the king and to the freedom of Bec. In fact, the monks having elected their prior, Boson, for abbot, because he had been a disciple of their great Abbot St. Anselm,[3] the king, much annoyed, at first rejected their choice, because of the zeal shown by this very Boson in the disputes between himself and St. Anselm.[4] However, at the repeated entreaty of the monks, Henry finally yielded. But Boson would not accept, and resisted both the wishes of his brethren[5] and the exhortations of the Archbishop of Rouen, fearing lest the king should require from him the homage he had resolved not to pay. He still felt himself bound by a promise made to Pope Urban II., who had now been dead for

. . . illos laudavit; sequenti vero die in capitulum venit, societatem eorum humiliter requisivit et recepit."—ORD. VIT., b. xii. p. 840.

[1] "Dixerat hæc et dicentis dexteram ori oculisque rex admovit."—MILO. CRISPIN., *Chron. Beccens. ad Calc.*, LANFRANC., ed. D'Achery, and in not. S. Anselmi, ed. Gerb., p. 580.

[2] "Utinam anima mea esset ubi anima ejus est."—*Ibid.*, and *Ann. Bened.*, b. 74, c. 75.

[3] "Quia bonus homo erat et amabilis, et maxime quia fuerat ex disciplina venerabilis Anselmi."—*De libertate Beccensis Monast.*, in Appen., vol. v., *Ann. Bened.*, No. 12.

[4] "Ut ferus homo omnino renuit. Erat enim ei infensus idem Boso, propter quasdam causas quæ inter ipsum Henricum et Anselmum quondam exstiterant."—*Ibid.*

[5] "Fratres humiliter prostraverunt se in terram, petentes ne eos desereret."—*Ibid.*

twenty-five years, that he would never perform such an act in honour of any layman;[1] but the Norman bishops were indignant at his refusal for such a reason. "What!" said they of Evreux and Lisieux, "we, who are bishops, do homage to the king, and here is a monk who says he will not do what everybody else does!"[2]

But however they might irritate the king against Boson as they rode beside him from Brienne to Rouen,[3] Henry dispensed the newly-elect from doing homage, and also from the solemn profession of obedience to the archbishop of that city.[4]

After the abbot's installation, the king exhorted him to remain faithful to the traditions of hospitality and austerity which made the glory of Bec,[5] promising him, on this condition, to protect the monastery, and saying, "You shall be abbot within doors, and I will be abbot without."[6]

About the time when the King of England was keeping

[1] "Olim cum apud domnum Apostolicum Urbanum conversarer, promisi ei, quasi ex fide, quod nunquam laico hominis hominium facerem," &c.—*Ann. Bened., loc. cit.*

[2] "Nos qui episcopi sumus, facimus hominium domino nostro, et iste monachus dicit se nullo modo facere quod omnes alii faciunt!"—*Ibid.* Cf. MILO. CRISP., *Vit. abb. Bec. post* LANFR., p. 48.

[3] "Cœperunt simul equitare unus a dextris et alter a sinistris."—*De Libert. Becc., loc. cit.*

[4] "Domine archiepiscope, scitote pro certo, quia iste abbas nec mihi faciet hominium, nec vobis professionem, et archiepiscopus a contra: domine, quod vobis beneplacitum est de re vestra facite ut dominus; de re vero quæ ad me proprie pertinet, inter me et ipsum bene conveniet; rex vero a contra; dixi vobis et adhuc dico per mortem Christi, quia abbas Becci nec mihi faciet hominium nec vobis professionem. Ad hæc conticuerunt ambo episcopi, et de re alia cœperunt loqui."—*Ibid.* This referred to a certain solemn profession of submission which was expressed by the formula *profiteor;* for it is evident that, at his benediction, the abbot agreed without difficulty to promise between the hands of the archbishop to be *subjectus* et *obediens* to the church of Rouen, using the word *volo.*

[5] "Admonuit eos ut laicos homo . . . hospitalitatem quæ magnum eis nomen acquisierat."—*Ibid.*

[6] "Tu esto intus abbas in ordine tuo; et ego ero abbas in rebus exterioribus."

up these familiar relations with the chief abbey of his Norman duchy, the King of France went to do feudal service at St. Denis, the great abbey of his kingdom, from which he acknowledged himself to hold the county of the Vexin as a fief.[1] The motive which the French sovereign obeyed in this case was very serious; he knew that the Emperor Henry V. had for five years been nourishing a bitter resentment against him on account of the assistance he had given to the pope during the Council of Rheims.[2] In fact, Henry hated that town, the scene of his humiliation; and, by agreement with his father-in-law, Henry of England, had decided to go at the head of a powerful army to besiege and destroy it. Warned of this scheme of aggression, the king summoned his nobles,[3] and then, remembering that the glorious martyr St. Denis, apostle of France, was the special protector of the kingdom which he had converted, he went to invoke the saint in the ancient abbey where his relics reposed; caused the sacred remains to be displayed upon the high altar, as was customary in great public dangers;[4] and taking from this same altar, as if from the hands of his feudal lord, the oriflamme, which was the banner of the county of Vexin, he hastened to the defence of Rheims.[5] With a single impulse, such as history seldom has to describe, the whole

[1] "Vexillum quod de comitatu Vilcassini, quoad ecclesiam feodatus est, spectat, votive tanquam a domino suo."—SUGER, *Vit. Lud. Gross.*, p. 312.

[2] "Collecto longo animi rancore contra D. regem L., eo quod in regno ejus Remis in concilio D. Calixti anathemate innodatus fuerat . . . proponens aut civitatem subito destruere aut tanta deshonestatione et oppressione civitatem obsidere, quanta D. papa in eum agens sedit sessione." —SUGER, *loc. cit.* "Imperator ratione illum concilii iratum Franciæ proposuit Remensem civitatem destruere."—GENEBRARD, *Chr. in Concil.*, xii. 1308.

[3] "Nobiles adciscit, causam exponit."—SUGER, *loc. cit.*

[4] "Et quoniam hanc ab eo habent prærogativam, ut si regnum aliud regnum Francorum invadere audeat, ipse beatus et admirabilis defensor cum sociis suis, tanquam ad defendendum altari suo superponatur."—*Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, *supra.*

of France followed him;[1] the most powerful and most distant vassals, such as the Dukes of Brittany and Aquitaine, the inhabitants of Champagne, of Picardy, and the Isle of France, gathered around Rheims, where a formidable army was organised, resolved to avenge the insults offered to her who was already called the Queen of nations.[2]

A monk of humble birth,[3] named Suger, newly elected abbot against the king's will,[4] led the vassals of the abbey of St. Denis, and it was among them that King Louis VII. placed himself, saying, "Here I shall fight best, under the protection of the saints, who are my lords, and in the ranks of my countrymen with whom I have been brought up."[5] The emperor, alarmed by the warlike attitude of the French, retired without having given them battle. The king immediately went to render solemn thanks to his suzerain, the great martyr St. Denis: he himself carried back into the venerable church the relics before which the monks,

[1] The account given by Suger, who was at Rheims, bears marks of the most ardent patriotism.

[2] "Transeamus, inquiunt (proceres), audacter ad eos, ne redeuntes impune faciant, quod in terrarum dominam Franciam superbe præsumpserint."

[3] Suger insists on his humble origin in several parts of his narrative, as we shall show.

[4] The king, not having been consulted about his election, caused the monks and noblest knightly feudatories of the abbey, who came to inform him of it, to be imprisoned at Orleans. Suger was thinking how to oppose this arbitrary conduct ("Romanæ Ecclesiæ vigore et D. papæ Calixti qui me diligebat auctoritate"), when the king changed his mind, released his prisoners, and received him willingly.—SUGER, *Vit. Lud. Gross.*, pp. 310, 311.

[5] "Nec acie tam securo quam strenue dimicabo, cum præter sanctorum dominorum suorum protectionem, etiam qui me compatriotæ familiarius educaverint, aut vivum jurabunt aut mortuum conservanter reportabunt." —*Ibid.*, 313. As it was not either the citizens of St. Denis or the knights of the neighbourhood who had brought the king up, it results from this passage that there were monks mixed with the soldiers. The presence of Suger himself is shown by this phrase of his account: "cum Remis undecumque convenessimus."

Abbot Suger's contemporaries, prayed day and night for the success of France.[1]

The abbey of St. Denis, however, was not the first in rank; she was counted after Cluny, which Louis le Gros called the noblest limb of his kingdom,[2] whose abbot disputed with that of Monte Cassino the title of *abbot of abbots*,[3] and whose greatness shed an unrivalled brilliance through every country of Christendom. In 1123, Pons, who had resigned the abbacy of Cluny, carried the sacred spear[4] at the head of the Christian army, which, though only three thousand strong, put to rout at Ybelin sixty thousand Saracens, and so saved Palestine. The following year Pons's successor, Peter the Venerable, restored peace to Catholic Spain, setting her free to employ all her forces against the Saracens; and shortly after, owing to his mediation between the kings of Castile and Arragon, a treaty was

[1] "Rex exhilaratus nec ingratus . . . lecticas argenteas quæ altari principali superpositæ toto spacio belli conventus extiterant, ubi continuo celeberrimo diei et noctis officio fratrum colebantur, multa devotissimi populi et religiosarum mulierum ad suffragandum exercitui frequentabantur multiplici oratione, Rex ipse proprio collo domnos et patronos suos cum lacrymarum affluentia filialiter loco suo reportavit."—SUGER, *loc. cit.* He made on that occasion numerous gifts to the abbey.

[2] "Nobilius membrum regni nostri."—In *Spicileg.*, vol. xiii. p. 301.

[3] At the Lateran Council, in 1116, where Pons, Abbot of Cluny, was plenipotentiary of the emperor. But his pretensions were crushed by the cardinal-chancellor of the Church, who obliged Pons to acknowledge that the Clunists, like all other monks of the Roman world, "omnes in orbo Romano monachos," had received their rule from St. Benedict and from Monte Cassino, and upheld the title of the abbot of that monastery: "ut ipse solus, qui tanti legiferi vicarius est, abbas abbatum appellatur." —*Chron. Cass.*, b. iv. c. 62.

[4] "Abbas Cluniacencis Pontius proferens lanceam transfixam in latere Christi."—ROBERT DEL MONTE, in *app. Sigeb.* Cluny had always had close relations with the East. The Archbishop of Edessa was *confrater* of the Burgundian abbey, and had been received in that character by St. Hugh when passing by Cluny to go from Flanders to Jerusalem.—*Ann. Ben.*, b. 73, No. 108. Peter the Venerable conferred the dignity on the Emperor of Constantinople, Alexis Comnenus, when reclaiming the abbey of La Charité, which the Emperor John Comnenus had given to Cluny.—PETR. VEN., b. iv. Ep. 35.

concluded by these two princes at the Clunist abbey of Najara.[1]

Thus at the two extremities of Christendom, two abbots of Cluny held the first rank both in war and peace.

So much glory, scarcely tarnished by the spots inseparable from human frailty, and the possession of so great a share in the greatest affairs of the Church and of the world, naturally excited lively opposition and formidable jealousy against the Clunist monks. Enemies were met with, not only among members of rival communities, but also among laymen devoted to the temporal power or attached to the emperor's person, such as those who, enraged at seeing the gates of the abbey of Prüfening shut against their excommunicated master, pointed out to him the monks occupied in their garden,[2] and cried, "Look at these cowl-wearers, how they treat our emperor! They do not even reverence the imperial dignity. They should be punished for their impudence, and taught that they cannot insult the diadem of the Cæsars with impunity."[3]

Even the clergy were not innocent of such ill-will; and the proof of it was seen when, for the first time since the conversion of England, an Archbishop of Canterbury was chosen who did not belong to the monastic ranks.[4]

[1] SANDOVAL, ap. PAGI, *Crit.*, in 1124, c. 18.

[2] "Fratres ad opera manuum . . . in horto forte intraverunt, quem vitis tunc sepes ambivit. . . . Invalescebant voces militum . . ."—*Acta S.* ERMENOLD., ap. BOLL., January 6.

[3] "Ecce cucullati, qui dominum nostrum temere despexerunt, nec imperialem sibi dignati sunt exhibere reverentiam. . . . Dent pœnas opprobrii et proterviæ . . . non ferant impune sprevisse Cæsareum diadema."—*Ibid.* The emperor, as we have already said, rejected their counsels, and respected the independence of Abbot Ermenold and his monks.

[4] William of Corbeil, a regular canon, elected in place of Raoul (or Ralph), monk of Bec, who had died in 1112. It seems that the regular canons, not being sons of St. Benedict, were not counted as monks.

We have spoken of the fruitless complaints made by the bishops of the province of Lyons against Cluny at the Council of Rheims.[1] At the Œcumenical Council at the Lateran, one of the canons of which forbade to abbots various episcopal and pastoral functions,[2] the prelates again protested against the encroachments of Monte Cassino and probably of the monks in general.[3]

"It only remains," they said, "that we should be deprived of the crosier and ring, and put under the orders of monks. They have the churches, towns, castles, tithes, the oblations of the living and of the dead. Canons and other clergy are fallen into discredit, while monks who are sup-

Already, in 1114, at Ralph's election, the bishops had shown an unwillingness to acknowledge a monk as St. Anselm's successor, but the antecedents had forced them to do so. Stigand, hitherto the only archbishop not a monk, had been deposed after the conquest, and never received the *pallium*.—EADMER, *Hist. novor.*, b. 5, p. 86. "Ecce," says the monk, Ordericus Vitalis, on the election of William—"ecce antiquus mos pro invidia, qua clerici contra monachos urebantur, depravatus fuit. . . . Angli monachos, quia per eos ad Deum conversi sunt, indesinenter diligentes, honoraverunt: ipsique clerici reverenter et benigne sibi monachos præferri gavisi sunt: Nunc autem mores et leges mutati sunt, et clerici, ut monachos confutent et conculcent, clericos extollunt."—*Ibid.*, xii. p. 873. However, William of Corbeil was succeeded, on his death in 1137, by Theodoric, a monk of Bec, the third Archbishop of Canterbury drawn from that illustrious monastery.

[1] By a bull of January 19, 1121, Calixtus laid the Bishop of Mâcon under an interdict until he should have repaired the wrong he had done to Cluny.—*Thesaur. anecd.*, i. 347. But we must not suppose that popes always defended abbeys against bishops: there is a deed of Pascal II. in which he blames the Abbot of Cluny for having consecrated the holy oil, and forbids him to do so in future.—*Reg. Pasc.*, No. 75, in COLETTI, *Concil.*, xii. 1030.

[2] "Interdicimus abbatibus et monachis publicas pœnitentias dare, et infirmos visitare, et unctiones facere, et missas publicas cantare. Chrisma et oleum, consecrationes altarium, ordinationes clericorum ab episcopis accipiant in quorum parochis manent."—Can. xvii.

[3] The end of the story seems to show that these complaints were only made against Monte Cassino. Fleury (b. 67, No. 31), by abbreviating the reply of the Ligurian bishop and the pope's decision, has generalised the accusations.

posed to have abandoned this world and all its lusts, pursue the things of the world with insatiable avidity, and, disdaining the portion offered to them by St. Benedict, only think day and night how they may rob bishops of their rights.[1] A monk of Monte Cassino answered, addressing himself to the pope: "We pray night and day for the salvation of the whole world, and the conduct of our abbots towards the Apostolic See has not been such that we should deserve to lose, under your pontificate, that which so many emperors, kings, dukes, and popes have offered to St. Benedict."[2] A bishop of Northern Italy then took up the defence of the monks, showed the reasons which had led former bishops to endow them, and the perpetual coexistence of the Monastic Orders with the active and secular clergy, and in conclusion said that it was the duty of bishops to love the monks, not to persecute them.[3] Pope Calixtus ended the discussion by declaring that the Church of Monte Cassino had been founded by the command of Christ Himself, who had inspired St. Benedict to make it a venerable sanctuary for all Christendom, and, as it were, the headquarters of the Monastic Orders; and that, moreover, it had been a sure refuge for the Roman Church in her adversity. "For this reason," added the pontiff, "following the steps of our predecessors, we decree that this monastery shall remain free for ever from all mortal authority, and under the sole guardianship

[1] "Episcopi adversus monachos invidia inflammati, cœperunt dicere, nil superesse aliud, nisi ut, sublatis virgis et annulis, monachis deservirent. Illos enim villas, castra, &c. . . . detinere; his quæ mundi sunt inhiare non desinunt, et quibus per B. Benedictum ultro quærendi locus offertur, ad episcoporum jura rapienda, diu noctuque occupantur."—*Chron. Cassin.*, b. iv. c. 80.

[2] "Neque enim ita Cassinenses abbates de sede apostolica meruerunt, ut quæ S. Benedicto imperatores . . . contulerunt, hæc apostolatus vestri tempore amitti mereamur."—*Chron. Cassin., loc. cit.*

[3] "Quidam Liguriæ episcopus . . . non sine causa prædecessores nostri monasteria ditaverunt. A principio namque surgentes Ecclesiæ duos ordines, &c. . . . unde non immerito nos potius diligere monachos, quam insequi convenit."—*Ibid.*

of the Roman Church. As to other monasteries, we command that they shall be maintained such as they were originally founded."[1]

The time was not yet come when the foes of the religious orders might hope to triumph. Far from being eclipsed, their glory every day shone more brightly. But lately Pope Calixtus, by confirming the Order of St. John of Jerusalem,[2] had introduced into the ranks of chivalry that deathless spirit of self-sacrifice and Christian devotion which has lived even to the days of modern society. As he passed through France after the glorious Council of Rheims, the sovereign pontiff also ratified the constitution of the Cistercian Order, which, having for years grown up in solitude, was to surpass in splendour as well as in productiveness all the past wonders of monastic history.[3]

Before his death, Calixtus II., the great pope who gave peace to the Church, might have seen issuing from the bosom of this new-born order, and shining on the horizon like a star without a rival, that Bernard who for thirty years was to animate and purify the Church by his breath, enlighten her by his doctrine, and transport her by his eloquence; who was to speak to the pope as a doctor, to kings as a prophet, to nations as a master; to aid the again menaced papacy, to dissipate schism, to confound in the person of Abélard revolted human reason, to merit the title of avenger of ecclesiastical free-

[1] "Imperato silentio dixit: Cassinensis Ecclesia non ab hominibus neque per hominem, sed per J. C. fundata est . . . cujus imperio Benedictus pater . . . orbi spectabilem reddidit, totiusque monastici ordinis caput esse constituit . . . cœnobium ab omni mortalium jugo quietum ac liberum manere."—*Chron. Cassin., loc. cit.*

[2] By the bull *Ad hoc nos disponente Domino*, June 19, 1120, according to Héliot, and of July 6, 1121, according to the *Hist. litt.*, vol. x. p. 522.

[3] St Bernard appeared for the first time to the eyes of the Church at the Council of Langres, at the end of Lent 1124. Calixtus died December 13th of the same year.

dom,[1] and to humble the heir of Henry V. and grandson of Henry IV. at the feet of an uncompromising champion of the Church and of society.

[1] "Vindex *Ecclesiasticæ libertatis.*" This is the inscription which was read until 1837 under his statue in the Cistercian abbey of Wellingen, in Switzerland, now defaced by the sacrilege of Aargan.

THE END

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co.
Edinburgh and London

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

This book is due on the date indicated below, or at the expiration of a definite period after the date of borrowing, as provided by the library rules or by special arrangement with the Librarian in charge.

DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE	DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE
SEP 8 1945	MAY 26 '52		
C28 (747) M100			

PHOTOCOP
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
0035518391

932
M76
6